

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



# YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

---

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY  
LAW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING  
Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.  
Wash. D. C. Ext. 4654

## HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS UNITED STATES SENATE NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

### S. 1076

A BILL TO ESTABLISH IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF THE  
INTERIOR AND AGRICULTURE A YOUTH CONSERVATION  
CORPS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

---

APRIL 21, 1969



Printed for the use of the  
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1969

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington, *Chairman*

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico  
ALAN BIBLE, Nevada  
FRANK CHURCH, Idaho  
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah  
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota  
GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota  
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin  
LEE METCALF, Montana  
MIKE GRAVEL, Alaska

GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado  
LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho  
PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona  
CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, Wyoming  
MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon  
TED STEVENS, Alaska  
HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma

JERRY T. VERKLER, *Staff Director*  
STEWART FRENCH, *Chief Counsel*  
WILLIAM J. VAN NESS, *Special Counsel*  
DENNY MILLER, *Professional Staff Member*  
CHARLES COOK, *Minority Counsel*



# CONTENTS

S. 1076 .....	Page 1
Departmental reports:	
Agriculture .....	3
Budget .....	3
Interior .....	2

## STATEMENTS

Clapper, Louis, director of conservation, National Wildlife Federation.....	78
Cole, Bert L., commissioner of public lands, State of Washington.....	23
Daniel, Frank C., secretary, National Rifle Association of America.....	89
Dolstad, John, student conservation program, Olympic National Park.....	33
Edwards, Dr. Alfred L., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Rural Develop- ment, Department of Agriculture.....	10
Freeman, George, Boy Scouts of America.....	74
Freeman, Mrs. Orville, Girl Scouts of America.....	70
Frome, Michael, conservation editor, Field & Stream magazine.....	58
Glasgow, Dr. Leslie L., Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources, Department of the Interior, accompanied by Frank A. Bracken, legislative counsel.....	7
Hruska, Hon. Roman, a U.S. Senator from the State of Nebraska.....	6
Kelly, Thomas E., commissioner of natural resources, State of Alaska.....	23
Kiernan, Owen B., executive secretary, National Association of Secondary School Principals.....	83
Massoni, Albert L., National Association of Counties.....	87
Peet, Nicholas, Manpower Administrator, Department of Labor.....	12
Penfold, Joseph, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America...	63
Pond, William B., executive officer, National Recreation & Parks Asso- ciation.....	80
Rillo, Dr. Thomas J., professor of environmental education, Glassboro State College.....	86
Smith, Dr. Spencer, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.....	50
Stahr, Dr. Elvis J., president, National Audubon Society.....	88
Stevens, Hon. Ted, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska.....	5
Studebaker, Sam, president, National Association of Soil & Water Con- servation Districts.....	66
Titus, Mrs. Elizabeth, president, Student Conservation Association, Inc..	31
Towell, William, executive vice president, American Forestry Association..	69
Twardzik, Dr. Louis, chairman, Department of Parks and Recreation Administration, Michigan State University.....	54
Ury, Dr. Claude, educational consultant, Kensington, Calif.....	84

## COMMUNICATIONS

Douglas, Philip A., executive secretary, Sport Fishing Institute: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Com- mittee, dated May 1, 1969.....	93
Gabrielson, Ira N., president, Wildlife Management Institute: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Com- mittee, dated April 21, 1969.....	92
Hodges, Ralph D., Jr., vice president, government relations, National Forest Products Association: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chair- man, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated April 22, 1969....	93
Rockefeller, Laurance S., New York, N.Y.: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated May 8, 1969.....	90

#### IV

Stoltenberg, Carl H., dean, Oregon State University: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated April 15, 1969-----	Page 91
Straub, Robert W., State treasurer, Salem, Oreg.: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated April 16, 1969-----	90
Wood, Louise A., national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated April 11, 1969-----	73
Wright, Jim, Southern Christian Leadership Conference: Letter to Hon. Henry M. Jackson, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, dated April 18, 1969-----	94

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Central Area Outdoor Education Program-----	34
"Straight Talk," by Ernie Swift-----	80

# YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

---

MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1969

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:55 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, Senator Henry M. Jackson (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Henry M. Jackson (Washington), Clinton P. Anderson (New Mexico), Frank E. Moss (Utah), Gordon Allott (Colorado), Len B. Jordan (Idaho), Paul J. Fannin (Arizona), Mark O. Hatfield (Oregon), and Ted Stevens (Alaska).

Also present: Jerry T. Verkler, staff director; Stewart French, chief counsel; William Van Ness, special counsel; Denny Miller and Daniel Dreyfus, professional staff members; and Charles Cook, minority counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

The purpose of today's hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1076, a bill which I introduced on February 18 to establish a Youth Conservation Corps within the Departments of Interior and Agriculture. I have been joined by 24 of my colleagues in sponsoring this measure.

A copy of the bill and the reports from Agriculture, Interior, and Budget will be included in the hearing record at this point.

(The data referred to follows:)

[S. 1076, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth upon whom will fall the responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources.

## YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out authorized programs with respect to the lands and waters referred to in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States,



its territories, or possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary. Members of the Corps shall be appointed without regard to geographical location or economic status.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine the areas under their administrative jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out programs using employees of the Corps. The rates and hours and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall be as jointly determined by the two Secretaries: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (28 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.), and the Act of September 6, 1966 (5 U.S.C. 8102 et seq.): *And provided further*, That no member of the Corps may be employed for a term in excess of ninety consecutive days during any one calendar year.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the Corps in their duties.

(d) The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to each Department such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your Committee has requested a report from this Department on S. 1076, a bill "To establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes."

The bill provides that the Youth Conservation Corps would be composed of young men and women 14 through 18 years of age. They would be employed for periods not to exceed 90 days in any 1 year by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. Their employment would be without regard to Civil Service classification laws or regulations. Members of the Corps would be considered Federal employees only for purposes of the Tort Claims Act, and laws relating to compensation for injuries. Rates, hours and other conditions of employment would be jointly determined by the two Secretaries, and each would be authorized to make appropriate provisions for transportation, lodging and subsistence.

If the bill were enacted, experienced personnel would be needed to work with young people between the ages of 14 and 18 and to provide them with the necessary supervision. Additional staff with these capabilities would be required if the Department were to successfully operate the youth conservation program. Because of present budgetary and personnel limitations, it would be extremely difficult to recruit such qualified people partially because of the temporary nature of their employment. Thus, while we support the objectives of the bill, our present departmental priorities dictate that any additional personnel made available must be used in other critical areas.

The Department also believes that the short term nature of the proposed projects, the fact that youths could not remain over 90 days, would mean constant change and substantially limit the learning experience. The participants would have to be assigned to the simplest types of activities which would not require continuity. The opportunity to develop a useful environmental orientation would be limited. This Department is concerned that the type of environmental exposure envisioned by the youth conservation program would not be realized under the present bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,  
*Under Secretary of the Interior.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,*  
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you asked, here is our report on S. 1076, a bill "To establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes."

The purpose of S. 1076 would be to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth upon whom will fall the responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources. It would declare a Congressional finding that gainful employment of youth in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the National Park, National Forest, and National Wildlife Refuge Systems, and other public lands administered by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage.

The bill would establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps. The Corps would consist of young men and women who have attained age 14 but have not attained age 19. The Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture would employ such youths for the purpose of developing, preserving or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under their jurisdiction. Members of the Corps would be employed without regard to Civil Service or classification authorities, and would be appointed without regard to geographical location or economic status.

The rates, hours, and areas of work and other conditions of employment in the Corps would be determined by the two Secretaries. Members of the Corps would generally not be deemed to be Federal employees. No member of the Corps could be employed for a term exceeding 90 consecutive days in any one calendar year.

The Secretaries would be authorized to provide transportation, lodging, subsistence and other services and equipment for the needs of members of the Corps. The provisions of Title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) would not apply to appointments made to the Corps.

We recommend that S. 1076 not be enacted. As presently structured, the bill could be interpreted to duplicate or overlap a number of youth programs presently authorized and operating.

Further there are not sufficient funds available to devote to such a program at this time. We, therefore, believe the present mix of programs can better meet the objectives for our Nation's youth. The conservation work which would be accomplished by a youth conservation work program should be done. However, there are more effective ways to do this work with the funds that are available for this purpose.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL,  
*Under Secretary.*

---

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for our comments on S. 1076, a bill "To establish in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes."

The bill provides for a Youth Conservation Corps consisting of young men and women between 14 and 19 years of age. Members of the Corps would be employed by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture for periods not to exceed 90 consecutive days in any one year in order to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States and to create an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's national environment and heritage. They would work on public land and water areas under



the jurisdiction of the two Departments. Their employment would be without regard to Civil Service classification laws or regulations. Rates, hours and other conditions of employment would be jointly determined by the two Secretaries, and each would be authorized to make appropriate provisions for transportation, lodging, and subsistence.

The Bureau of the Budget generally concurs in the comments of the Departments of Labor, Interior, and Agriculture, and the Office of Economic Opportunity on this bill.

While the Youth Conservation Corps is intended to promote conservation objectives, the short time period of employment in the Corps would make it of doubtful value in promoting conservation work of more significance than the simplest of activities. It would also limit the usefulness of the Corps in terms of providing training and work experience of lasting value. Moreover, the Federal Government is already specifically involving young people in conservation and related activities, for short and longer term periods, through the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Community Action agencies, and Job Corps conservation centers.

In view of the many demands on the always limited availability of Federal budget funds, we do not believe this program represents a high priority use of scarce budget dollars. For one thing, the provisions in the bill for lodging and subsistence could result in a significant expense per enrollee, estimated by the Department of Labor as at least \$1,000 for the 90 days of employment, excluding transportation. As the Department points out in its testimony, this compares with \$400 per enrollee in the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program. In addition, this program is not directed to disadvantaged youth, who are most in need of manpower services and jobs.

For these and the other reasons cited by the various executive branch agencies asked to comment, the Bureau of the Budget recommends against enactment of S. 1076.

Sincerely yours,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,  
*Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.*

The CHAIRMAN. The Youth Conservation Corps program would be open to both young men and women between the ages of 14 and 18 who would be employed during the summer months for periods of up to 90 days. They would perform a wide array of conservation duties in national parks, forests, and wildlife and recreation areas.

Let me make it clear that this is not an effort to continue the Job Corps program under a new name. The Civilian Conservation Centers which are operated under the Job Corps are designed to train and rehabilitate youth who have not received an adequate education, or who do not have vocational skills necessary to enter the domestic labor force. In my view, the Job Corps program has been extremely useful both in terms of its contribution to the development and management of our natural resources and in its role in providing youth with the basic skills to make a contribution in our society. I deeply regret that the administration has chosen to cut back this program.

The legislation under consideration today is designed to provide summer employment opportunities for youth, primarily those from urban areas, who have varying economic, social and racial backgrounds. Far too many young Americans never have an opportunity to receive meaningful work experiences. Because of the summer employment problems in our urban areas, young men and women often turn from walking the streets seeking jobs to roaming the streets in pursuit of socially unacceptable goals. This can be and is intended to be a preventive program. It can prevent a youngster from dropping out of school by providing summer earnings and by stimulating interest in learning. It can prevent delinquency by providing meaningful work.

The unemployment rate among our Nation's youth has remained at unsatisfactorily high levels during the current sustained period of

economic growth. More than a year ago, the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders reported that the lack of substantial employment opportunities for the youth trapped in urban ghettos was one of the principal causes of riots. The youth of these areas were characterized as encountering a life of despair and hopelessness.

The Commission recommended greatly expanded training and employment opportunities for ghetto youth as the primary component of an attack on the causes of urban poverty. We hope to reach many of these young men and women through the Youth Conservation Corps and to demonstrate to them that they can play a significant role in the functioning of our society.

At a time when there is great national concern for the maintenance of the natural environment and for meeting the burgeoning demands for outdoor recreation, measures must be taken to intensify our resource management programs. If the future leaders of our Nation are to be expected to understand that the great out-of-doors has a relevant role in their lives, they must gain this appreciation through means other than reading textbooks. They must actually experience the sense of accomplishment in completing a difficult task, of understanding the intricacies of land and water conservation and management, and of working in programs to assure that future generations of Americans will enjoy life in a quality environment.

These young men and women would be employed in meaningful conservation duties. They could help to reduce the tremendous backlog of maintenance and development work necessary in our park and recreation lands. They could assist in intensive forest management programs designed to increase the long-range sustainable harvests from these lands. They could be expected to perform such duties as trail maintenance, wildlife habitat improvement and watershed conservation work.

There is also an intangible benefit which would accrue to the Youth Conservation Corps enrollees. The program would provide unique opportunities for youth to understand the causes and to learn to overcome the prejudice and misunderstanding which exist in our society. Youth from a variety of social, economic, and racial backgrounds could work and learn together in an environment conducive to open communications, understanding, and companionship.

During the first year of operation, I visualize that this program would be conducted on a pilot basis for approximately 3,000 trainees in an effort to minimize initial costs and to provide an opportunity for a review before expansion in future years.

The Chair will also state that the Senator from Alaska, Mr. Stevens, has a statement.

#### **STATEMENT OF HON. TED STEVENS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ALASKA**

Senator STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to submit my testimony today in support of S. 1974, a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. Alaska, probably more than any other State in the Nation, is replete with wilderness areas untouched by man. The opportunities are boundless in Alaska for the sustained and orderly development of a matchless system of parks and recreation areas.



If the funds for this project are available, Alaska could put many hundreds of young people to work during a summer on needed conservation projects. This is true, even if we utilize every available Alaskan youth for this work—the magnitude of the task in Alaska is that great.

Mr. Chairman, although Alaska is a largely rural State that is without the problems of the large urban areas of the Nation, we can appreciate the difficulties that exist today. Literally thousands of our Nation's youth have never really seen a wilderness area, let alone experienced the joy of living in one. They have grown up in huge cities with smog and traffic jams and no opportunity to get away from these conditions. Our urban environment today is basically hostile to man. The air and water are too often poisoned, the noise level is unbelievable, and human beings are sandwiched together like spawning salmon. This is not the way men and women were intended to live, and the result is crime, filth, poverty, and a steadily growing alienation of man from the land on which he lives.

One of the purposes of this bill is to give young people—the young people whose future is our own future—a chance to breathe, a chance to step outside their normal surroundings and the stifling urban environment to look around and see that life has real meaning. One of our paramount objectives for the future must be to increase the quality of life in our country, whether in the urban area or the rural. And this legislation can make a good beginning in accomplishing just that objective. For, once a young person has tasted the joys of clean air and seen a thousand miles of forest untouched by man, he will be more readily convinced of the immediacy of the problems in his home area. We will be building character in these young people, new recreational and park facilities for all Americans, and, most important, a deep resolve for the future that we can control and beautify our environment for the benefit of all. Surely such an objective is worthy of our unstinting support.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other committee member wish to make a statement at this time?

Senator Hruska of Nebraska has sent a statement for the record that will be included at this point.

#### **STATEMENT OF HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEBRASKA**

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Chairman, every summer the statistics on unemployment published by the Government show a striking leap upward. For example, in 1968, we are told unemployment advanced from 2,303,000 in May to 3,614,000 in June.

The increase should not surprise us. It represents, of course, the young people getting out of school and college for the summer and wanting jobs. Unfortunately, there are never enough jobs to go around. Some find good jobs; some make do with part-time jobs; some can find nothing at all to do.

Unfortunately, the latter group includes a disproportionately large number of those who, for racial and other reasons, have already had more than their share of discouragements and other obstacles to contend with.



Meanwhile, there is in fact plenty of summer work to be done in this country. We can use constructively the energies of these young people, or at least a good many of them. I am thinking of the conservation work that needs doing in our forests and parks, the needed construction of simple facilities such as campsites and trails, and so on. This is work that can be done with unskilled labor under proper supervision.

I endorse the program to be authorized by the bill, S. 1076. Simply put, it is a program of creating outdoor jobs in large numbers for our young people. The jobs would be 90-day summer jobs only, for youths of high school age only, and chiefly at the unskilled level. I am assuming that the wage scale offered would be appropriate for unskilled teenage labor, and that lodging, subsistence, and so on could be provided on an inexpensive basis.

It would offer an opportunity and fair pay for those willing to work, but no reward for those looking for a "free lunch." It would also give us a means of getting much-needed conservation work done. I will not attempt to speculate how large a program it should be. Previously, it was noted that more than 1 million young people are listed as unemployed in June, but I am not suggesting that the program should attempt to take care of any such number. Let us start this program small, and make practical and effective use of the labor of the young people we employ. On the basis of experience, it can then be determined how widely the program might be extended.

The program is described in S. 1076 as a Youth Conservation Corps. The title may be descriptive enough, but I cannot help thinking that it may unintentionally cause public confusion as between this group, and the Job Corps, the Peace Corps, and other specialized organizations. Without reflection on those other groups, it is therefore suggested that consideration be given to finding another title for this program which omits the word "Corps." We are here proposing simply to give summer jobs to young people, mostly unskilled, on the traditional American principle of fair pay for hard work. If we can adhere to that principle, I believe this program can make a most constructive contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The first witness will be Dr. Leslie Glasgow, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Dr. Glasgow, we are delighted to have you with us this morning.

**STATEMENT OF DR. LESLIE L. GLASGOW, ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
FOR FISH, WILDLIFE, PARKS AND MARINE RESOURCES, DEPART-  
MENT OF THE INTERIOR; ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK A. BRACKEN,  
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL**

Dr. GLASGOW. I have with me this morning Mr. Frank Bracken, Legislative Counsel, whom I would like to introduce to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bracken, we are delighted to welcome you.

You may proceed, Dr. Glasgow, you have your prepared statement.

Dr. GLASGOW. Yes; I do.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Department of the Interior and to testify on S. 1076, a bill to establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

The bill provides that the Youth Conservation Corps would be composed of young men and women 14 through 18 years of age. They would be employed for periods not to exceed 90 days in any one year by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. Their employment would be without regard to civil service classification laws or regulations. Members of the Corps would be considered Federal employees only for purposes of the Tort Claims Act, and laws relating to compensation for injuries. Rates, hours, and other conditions of employment would be jointly determined by the two Secretaries, and each would be authorized to make appropriate provisions for transportation, lodging, and subsistence.

If the bill were enacted, experienced personnel would be needed to work with young people between the ages of 14 and 18 and to provide them with the necessary supervision. Additional staff with these capabilities would be required if the Department were to successfully operate the youth conservation program. Because of present budgetary and personnel limitations, it would be extremely difficult to recruit such qualified people partially because of the temporary nature of their employment. Thus, while we support the objectives of the bill, our present departmental priorities dictate that any additional personnel made available must be used in other critical areas.

The Department also believes that the short-term nature of the proposed projects, the fact that youths could not remain over 90 days, would mean constant change and substantially limit the learning experience. The participants would have to be assigned to the simplest types of activities which would not require continuity. The opportunity to develop a useful environmental orientation would be limited. This Department is concerned that the type of environmental exposure envisioned by the youth conservation program would not be realized under the present bill.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Glasgow, I realize this is not within your province because you have been directed by higher authority; namely, the Bureau of the Budget, to the effect that the administration cannot approve the present proposed bill, but I would hope that the administration would reconsider its position, particularly with the idea of handling this program on a trial basis this summer.

I think the budget estimates that we have received is that my proposal would cost about \$2 million to employ 3,000 youngsters for 90 days. I would hope that you will take that message back.

I am not expecting you to necessarily comment on my remarks, because I believe there is general agreement, if there is agreement on priorities, that this is a very important program as far as the Department of the Interior is concerned. Is that correct?

Dr. GLASGOW. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Department feels that there is a real need for this sort of program, but you are under a directive that involves the budgetary limitations; is that correct?

Dr. GLASGOW. We have very critical budgetary limitations.

The CHAIRMAN. You mentioned in your statement, and I quote: “\* \* \* our present departmental priorities dictate that any additional personnel made available must be used in other critical areas.”

I wonder what those other critical areas are?



Dr. GLASGOW. At the present time we do not have technical staff sufficient to carry out the program of the Department. We do have some severe limitations which I think would receive top priority.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Glasgow, you mentioned the difficulty in recruiting qualified supervisory personnel to administer the program. I had in mind, of course, that we would utilize the great reservoir of high school and university instructor talent available during the summer months, plus college students who would serve as assistants. I am sure you would agree that these people could do a good job, if properly recruited, would you not?

Dr. GLASGOW. I am sure they would, but on the other hand some of the needs or objectives of our bureaus cannot be carried out now and if we were to add additional employees, we would like to fill those vacancies.

The CHAIRMAN. Our parks and recreational areas and national forests are sorely in need of maintenance support, and I would just like to express the hope the administration will reconsider its position, especially keeping in mind the need to meet these critical items in our conservation program. I think, too, that a summer program limited to 3,000 youngsters would represent a very small dent in the budget. I just want to express that opinion. I would hope that in the light of all these needs that the administration will reconsider its position on this matter.

Senator Anderson?

Senator ANDERSON. I don't have any questions.

I was the Relief Administrator in 1935. I am sure that this could be done very well and would be very helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Stevens?

Senator STEVENS. No thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Moss?

Senator MOSS. I just reiterate at this point that I feel regret that we have not been able to get clearance to undertake this project, because I think it would be very successful. I know the needs in the forests. We have problems out our way. I also know about the personnel limitations because I have been complaining about closing our national parks 2 days a week just because of lack of personnel. It seems to me that we have to come around to the point where we do what we have to do in these recreation and scenic areas, and this, I think, is a good program, also.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that there may be some misunderstanding in the original presentation of this matter that we were to start on a massive program. The bill is permissive, and I would hope that we could reach some kind of agreement with the administration on a pilot program for this summer to see how it works. I think this would be a sensible and reasonable approach, and it would be very helpful from the standpoint of conserving both the youngsters and our great natural resources.

Thank you very much, Dr. Glasgow. We appreciate having your statement and we are delighted to welcome you. I believe this is your first appearance here since you were confirmed.

Dr. GLASGOW. It is, and I thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. We will look forward to having you back here when you can tell us that you are going to go along on this pilot program.

Dr. GLASGOW. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. We hope that won't be long. Thank you, Doctor.

The next witness is Dr. Alfred L. Edwards, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Rural Development, Department of Agriculture. We are having all doctors here this morning. Dr. Edwards.

**STATEMENT OF DR. ALFRED L. EDWARDS, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Dr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I do not have a prepared statement on S. 1076. I do have a few notes which I would like to refer to.

The Department of Agriculture concurs in the administration's position as outlined by my colleague, Dr. Glasgow, as will be further, I hope, detailed by the representatives of the Department of Labor.

As we indicated in our report to the committee, the bill could be interpreted to duplicate or overlap a number of youth programs which are presently authorized and operating. We believe, particularly in view of the limited available funds, that the present mix of programs perhaps can better meet the objectives of our Nation's youth at this time.

On the other hand, we also believe that the conservation work which could be accomplished by a youth conservation work program should be done, but we believe there may be more effective ways to do this conservation work, particularly given the funds that are available at this time.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I realize that you are here under circumstances that require you to present a view that may not be your own personal view; that you are carrying out an administrative assignment. We are all familiar with that responsibility. But don't you feel that there is a real need to get the youngsters out of the ghettos and to give them an opportunity to work, I am just asking you this as a general question, in the national parks, recreation areas, and our national forests to give them an opportunity to get that unusual experience of the out-of-doors?

I was shocked when I found out that in the central area of Seattle where we have a large number of minorities, that almost all of the youngsters have not even visited what we call Woodland Park, which is right in the city. Their whole record or tendency is that they stay right in the ghetto. This legislation, of course, would give them an opportunity to work in the national forests and national parks only an hour and a half away from where they actually reside. Don't you feel this would be very useful for youngsters 14 to 18 years old?

Dr. EDWARDS. Yes, sir. We could do this, however, with some of the existing programs. For example, I suspect that the real reason some of the youngsters don't get out to these parks is because they are unaware of them and don't know the opportunities that exist, so we are suggesting perhaps a good informational program among the existing youth organizations without going to the additional expense of providing employment. I suspect there are other programs that would give youth employment benefits, but we suggest taking



the extension of the 4-H program which, if brought into urban areas, which we are trying to do, could give these kids the additional experience without the expense involved.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't it a fact that neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Department of the Interior can hire youngsters 14 to 18 years old to work in the forests or parks? You don't have that authority?

Dr. EDWARDS. I am not thinking about hiring. I thought the thrust of the whole thing was to give the student or youngster an opportunity to take advantage of nature, and what I am suggesting is that this might be accomplished without having to employ them by simply voluntary programs where they can get out and enjoy the existing facilities.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is a cinch that nothing is being done about it. Most of these youngsters don't have the advantages of kids that belong to a Scout troop and who can get out and hike in the mountains and so on. The point is that this is an effort to move these youngsters out of the ghettos and give them an opportunity to work in the forests during the summer when they are out of school. I know there are some limited community programs which involve summer camps and recreational outlets. That has been going on for 50 to 60 years in this country.

Don't you feel that the youth conservation program is a move in the right direction, and that we ought to try it and see what kind of a response we get?

The U.S. Forest Service is in need of a lot of maintenance work. I feel that we are way way behind in our maintenance work, particularly in trails and roads.

We also have a timber problem on our hands, primarily a shortage of logs, and there is a real need to conduct intensive reforestation measures. I feel the Youth Conservation Corps enrollees could plant trees, clear brush, and conduct other necessary duties.

I don't know of anything better for a youngster than to do some hard work during the summer. I worked in a sawmill during the summer months pulling 2 by 12's. I worked out in the out-of-doors on construction work before I was 18 years of age, and it didn't do me any harm, in fact, I think it provided me some valuable experience.

I just hope that the Department will reconsider this legislation in light of the suggestion that we at least try this on a pilot basis, such as employing some 3,000 youngsters for a period of 90 days this summer. I realize the directives that you are operating under, and I think you have done a very good job of presenting it under those limitations. However, I hope you will take this message back to the Secretary because I know the members of the committee feel that there is a real need for this, first for the youngsters, and second, to conserve our resources.

Dr. EDWARDS. I will be pleased to convey this to the Secretary, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Senator Anderson?

Senator ANDERSON. No questions. Thank you very much, Doctor.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nicholas Peet, Manpower Administrator, Department of Labor.

Mr. Peet.

STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS PEET, MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR,  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. PEET. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, effective conservation programs in the Nation's parks and forests and efforts to instill the Nation's young people with an appreciation of their natural heritage are highly laudable objectives. Therefore, I regret that I cannot appear before you today in support of the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. The proposed legislation does not provide a sound basis for furnishing trained manpower to carry out useful conservation activities. In my estimation, it does not offer an efficient and practical way for developing the occupational skills of young men and women. And it overlooks the various employment and work experience programs for young people that are already in existence and which have conservation components in many instances.

I shall discuss our reasons for opposing this bill under five principal headings.

1. *Limited usefulness of experience.*—First, the usefulness of experience contemplated by this bill would be severely limited because of (a) the extremely short period of time during which any person would be permitted to be enrolled and (b) the inexperience of the youth involved. Employment under this bill would be restricted to 90 days in any calendar year. The periods of time which would be required in orientation, instruction regarding the operation of tools and equipment, physical conditioning, and the rudiments of first aid, and woodcraft would leave little, if any, time for productive work at remote locations. In general, the young people enrolled in the program could only be given light work involving simple hand tools or cleanup activities suitable for inexperienced labor.

Thus, it would not be possible for these youth to undertake in the short space of 90 days much of the work contemplated by this bill. It was indicated that projects would include the "maintenance and construction of campgrounds, bridges, trails, water control structures, picnic facilities, plus assistance in forest reseeding, timber stand improvement, and other basic forest, soil, and conservation and wildlife habitat measures." These seem beyond accomplishment by youth who lack a substantial background in mechanical and conservation skills.

2. *High cost.*—Second, the residential character of this program would raise costs significantly. Based on costs encountered in similar programs, it is estimated that the program proposed by this bill would cost at least \$1,000 per enrollee. Costs might well range higher, particularly if extensive transportation were involved. This compares with costs of about \$400 per enrollee incurred last summer and expected next summer in the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

3. *Alternative summer youth opportunities.*—Third, the Federal Government has a host of summer work programs which will reach over 600,000 youth this summer. Some of the specific projects already involve conservation activities.

This summer it is expected that the Neighborhood Youth Corps will provide employment experience to more than 350,000 youth. A number of these projects are in the conservation area, involving maintenance, beautification, painting, tree trimming, and planting.



Much useful conservation work which can safely be performed by youth is available near their homes and does not involve the heavy cost of transporting and maintaining them at remote locations in the National Parks and Forests. In addition, it should be noted that these NYC programs encompass counseling, orientation, and frequently remedial education as well as work experience.

Examples of these projects include—

Project "Weld," New York State Department of Labor at Albany employing 335 enrollees in conservation work.

United Planning Organization, Washington, D.C., employs approximately 230 enrollees in conservation work.

Economic Opportunity Council, Inc., Malone, N.Y., employs approximately 200 enrollees in conservation work.

Illinois Farmers Union, Springfield, Ill., employs 200 enrollees in conservation in 72 Illinois counties.

Rockingham County Community Action Council, Portsmouth, N.H., employs 75 enrollees in conservation work.

Community Renewal Team of Greater Hartford, Hartford, Conn., employs approximately 60 enrollees in conservation work.

West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, Charleston, W. Va. employs 400 enrollees in conservation work.

Cheyenne River Indian Tribe, Eagle Butte, S. Dak., 180 enrollees engaged in conservation work.

City of Butte, Mont., 150 enrollees engaged in conservation work.

South Colorado Community Action Agency, Durango, Colo., 134 enrollees engaged in conservation work.

Kentucky Division of Forestry, Frankfort, Ky., 165 enrollees engaged in conservation work.

Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing, Mich., 75 enrollees engaged in conservation work throughout the State.

Lower Chattahoochee Community Action Agency, Columbus, Ga., employs 200 enrollees in conservation work.

In addition to the summer employment positions in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Federal Government, itself, expects to hire approximately 70,000 disadvantaged youth. Jobs available this summer under the JOBS program operated in conjunction with the National Alliance of Businessmen are expected to total 175,000—all for disadvantaged youth.

Aside from employment programs, it is expected that over 5,600 youth will be trained in Defense installations under "Project Value." Both the Department of Labor and the Civil Service Commission are cooperating in the operation of this program.

In addition, the Office of Economic Opportunity is funneling approximately \$35 million for summer youth programs through Community Action Agencies.

4. *No priority for disadvantaged youth.*—Fourth, the bill fails to define any target group and further, does not afford a priority to disadvantaged youth.

Present manpower programs, including those directed toward youth during summer months, contain a built-in preference for persons who are disadvantaged. This preference is necessary and desirable in order to target public resources on those youth most in need of work experience and income.

Maintenance of this preference is highly desirable and a crucial factor in the design of summer youth programs as they have been developed by the Vice President in this and the previous administration. However, this bill does not provide for such a priority and actually prevents its application by prohibiting a person's "economic status" from being used as a factor in his selection.

5. *Safety and supervision.*—Finally, the bill raises serious questions of safety and supervision for enrollees.

Some of the work described would require the use of power tools and equipment at remote locations. Much of it would, of necessity, involve work which an employer in interstate commerce would be prohibited from assigning these youth under the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The intense instruction and extremely close supervision required to adequately protect these youth from serious injury might well completely offset the anticipated reductions in the workload of regular National Park and Forest Service personnel. This bill contains no provisions dealing with safety and supervision.

In conclusion, let me say that the administration recognizes a need to expand programs of training, recreation, and guidance to stimulate personal growth of the youth in the Nation. It also recognizes the need to take appropriate steps to preserve and conserve the Nation's parks and forests. The Department of Labor, in conjunction with the Office of Economic Opportunity, is currently exploring methods by which those Job Corps conservation camps scheduled for closing may be put to use by the States and other agencies with an interest in conservation. However, the administration opposes this bill because it does not promise to achieve effectively the goals of the personal development of youth and conservation.

I ask the committee to accept this statement in lieu of the written report on this bill requested by the committee. The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this statement from the standpoint of the administration's program.

I can summarize our position's five major points:

First, the administration opposes the bill in that it provides a rather limited usefulness as an experience. When you restrict the experience to 90 days, the process of orientation, including tool use, first aid, and woodcraft leaves a relatively limited period of time to gain experience. If the value of the project is viewed from a work experience in the forests, we feel this would be quite limited.

Second, the residential character and the supervision that is attendant to this sort of project makes its cost relatively high when viewed in terms of some of the alternate ways of achieving the same end. For example, the cost, if the minimum wage is observed, will be roughly \$1,000 per enrollee as compared to the NYC cost of \$400.

Third, there are alternate opportunities for youth to gain such experience. The NYC program this summer will reach approximately 350,000 young people and many of these will be working in conservation. Under the NYC approach we do provide for counseling, orientation, and frequently remedial education as well.

The fourth problem relates to the disadvantaged. The bill does not provide for a priority for the disadvantaged. As a matter of fact it expressly provides that no such priority shall be provided.

The fifth and final point deals with safety and supervision. Some of this work will involve power tools on which employers in interstate



commerce would not be allowed to use individuals aged 14 through 18 years because of the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This bill provides nothing in the way of a provision for the safety of the youth.

In conclusion, while the administration realizes the need for such programs, and the need for appropriate steps to preserve and conserve our parks and forests, we feel that the bill does not provide for an effective way to achieve either of these two objectives.

The CHAIRMAN. I am really amused by the statement that you don't think these youngsters could, in effect, do a good job during the summer months in the forests. Have you worked in the out-of-doors and been in the forests?

Mr. PEET. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In what State?

Mr. PEET. Oregon.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you really believe the statement that youngsters 14 to 18 couldn't do a good job in a 90-day period working in our national forests and parks?

Mr. PEET. We are talking about the terms of the bill, under which you stated in your introductory speech that youth would be engaged in building bridges, soil conservation, timber stand improvement, water control structures, and similar work. When you take a 14-year-old into the timber on a residential basis, with a 90-day limited experience and provide first aid background for him, and full orientation such as training in the use of tools, it leaves a relatively short period of time for him to actually gain experience working.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have a mix here, though, you know. It is not all 14-year-olds. It is 14 to 18 year olds, and in addition, you have the regular summer program that the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior operate, namely, maintenance crews.

The State of Washington has done a lot of this, and I am sure the State of Oregon has also. These youngsters can build trails, plant trees, and conduct a long list of other jobs. You don't have to make them carpenters, or plumbers, or structural steelworkers, or something like that.

Mr. PEET. This is true, Senator. The question really revolves around relative degrees of efficiency. I would leave it to Dr. Glasgow to respond as to the efficiency of the conservation work. Given equal dollars, you could achieve more actual conservation work in our experience and judgment than you can this way if forest rehabilitation were strictly the goal. If the goal is to provide an experience in working in the woods with these tools. We are saying that it is a relatively inefficient way to do it. For approximately \$400 we are doing this in NYC now and the program proposed in this bill would cost approximately \$1,000.

This would be a high cost way of achieving that orientation. There is no question that the program proposed in this bill would provide some asset value.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us about the Neighborhood Youth Corps in this regard. Are they quite efficient, more efficient than the youngsters that would be working under this program in the forests, and in the management of our parks? Do I understand you correctly that NYC enrollees are involved in the conservation area, in maintenance, beautification, tree planting, tree trimming, and so on?

Mr. PEET. Yes. As I indicated, it is a matter of relative degrees of efficiency. We do have NYC projects in the parks, forest service, cities, rural areas, and hatcheries, and they are doing, and will do, sodding, planting of shrubbery, replanting, clearing of trails and related work. But this will cost an average of \$400 for the same period of time. From a relative efficiency standpoint, the costs of the proposed bill are quite substantial.

The CHAIRMAN. Does that \$400 include all of the indirect costs?

Mr. PEET. Yes; the appropriation I believe is \$121.5 million for 291,000 youth approximately, and this amounts to a little over \$400. That is the total cost of all NYC, including supervision.

The CHAIRMAN. It covers overhead and all associated costs? The enrollees are paid the minimum wage?

Mr. PEET. This assumes a minimum wage of \$1.60, the same basis that we used in looking at your bill, although the bill does not indicate the wage; NYC works 26 hours a week, and we priced it out on that basis.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-six hours a week?

Mr. PEET. On the NYC.

The CHAIRMAN. When they are out in the woods, they are going to be working more than 26 hours a week under this program.

Mr. PEET. Well, Senator, if they work a 40-hour week in the woods, if you ignore the cost of transportation to and from the worksite and the cost of transportation from their city to the forest, the cost will then be approximately \$1,047 per. That is on a \$1.60 per hour, 40-hour week, one supervisor for 20 people, and food and lodging with an estimated cost of approximately \$2.50 per day.

The CHAIRMAN. I am really surprised that you feel that employing these youngsters for 90 days during a summer would not be an efficient operation. I must say that my own experience in observing some of these undertakings is just to the contrary. Everyone I have talked with who is familiar with this sort of thing feels as I do.

Senator Allott.

Senator ALLOTT. Well, I would like to ask one thing. I am concerned. You have pointed out in your statement, Mr. Peet, very well I think, the other youth program works that are going on in the Government. The thought occurs to me as to why this particular bill is necessary at this time.

In your third paragraph you talk about the Neighborhood Youth Corps giving employment to 350,000 and you talk about the vast host of summer work programs which will reach over 600,000 youth this summer. But there is nothing in here to give any preference to disadvantaged youth, is there? In this bill?

Mr. PEET. No, sir, there is not.

Senator ALLOTT. Therefore, we might have in this group a lot of youth who really do not need the employment and who are able to sustain themselves and learn in other ways than by this method? Would that be true?

Mr. PEET. You are referring to the bill before us?

Senator ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. PEET. Yes, sir, this is correct.

Senator ALLOTT. I must say that one of the two things that bothers me about the entire matter is that we do have all of these other programs going, and I really can't see any need for this. It seems to me



if you have these other programs going, the better method might be, if that were the will of the Congress, to expand them rather than to start a new one here which will require new administrative effort and which gives no preference to disadvantaged youth.

That is all I have to say about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let me just clarify a couple of points here.

The Equal Opportunity Act of 1964, Public Law 88-452, which set up the Job Corps, as I recall, originally stated as follows:

The Corps shall be composed of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, age 16 to 21.

There are no requirements that specify a review of the economic background of the enrollees, is that correct?

Mr. PEET. They have to be certified as poor, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in the statute, is it?

Mr. PEET. At this point?

The CHAIRMAN. I am just reading from the provision in the law stating what the requirements are. The purpose of making this general is to have some flexibility here. We have some wild youngsters who may come from a rather affluent background. In fact, some of the real troublemakers are not necessarily the poor and the disadvantaged. Isn't that correct?

Mr. PEET. It's the administrative guidelines that specify the poor and provide that criterion.

The CHAIRMAN. It's not in the statute.

Mr. PEET. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Interior and Agriculture Departments can do the same under my bill.

Mr. PEET. No, sir. Your bill says on page 2, fourth line from the bottom: "shall be appointed without regard to geographical location or economic status."

It says it specifically.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think it ought to be left discretionary. They can, by policy of their own, decide to consider this on a priority basis. There is nothing to prohibit employing those who are in the greatest need.

Do you have an amendment to suggest to this?

Mr. PEET. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If youngsters in existing programs administered by your department are doing so much conservation work, tell me how many are working in our national forests, national parks, and national recreation areas. I am speaking of young men and women outside of the regular summer employees who are 18 or over and are hired by the Departments of Interior or Agriculture?

Mr. PEET. Employed by those two units?

The CHAIRMAN. You know they have statutory authority to hire temporary employees during the summer months. They have to be 18 years old or older. Tell me how many are employed?

Mr. PEET. I have no idea how many.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you will find there are almost none.

Mr. PEET. I am not qualified to speak on that.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you are leaving the impression here that the youngsters in these other programs are now getting the experience of

working in the forests, parks, and recreation areas, when, in fact, they are not. Most of them are right in the slums working in the urban areas.

Mr. PEET. I assume, sir, we are referring to how many Interior and Agriculture employ. If we are broadening this to include how many are employed in recreation areas and forests—

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the various youth corps programs.

Mr. PEET. We have many of these.

The CHAIRMAN. That are working in the national forests and parks?

Mr. PEET. For example, New York department, 335 in conservation.

The CHAIRMAN. In conservation, but you didn't answer the question. They may be conserving something locally in the community. How many of the Neighborhood Youth Corps participants are working in the national forests under the Department of Agriculture or in any other manner under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture or any manner under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior? How many of them?

Mr. PEET. I have no idea.

The CHAIRMAN. I am told by the staff almost none.

Mr. PEET. This could be. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. I would think you would want to know this. You are basing your case on the fact that all this is being done for them.

Mr. PEET. No. We have many projects nationwide that are involved in this sort of work in conservation and in timber areas, but when we specify within national parks or forest lands under Agriculture to this degree we haven't your figures.

The CHAIRMAN. In which States are they employed?

Mr. PEET. We have them in New York. These are listings of States where they are in operation: New York, Illinois, New Hampshire, West Virginia, South Dakota, Montana, Colorado, Kentucky, Michigan, and Georgia, that I have before me.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they doing?

Mr. PEET. Sodding, planting shrubs, clearing fire trails, replanting, building and repairing roadways, developing lands for recreation, picnic areas, general landscaping.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not working on any Federal lands in those areas?

Mr. PEET. I don't know the answer to that. My guess would be they probably are not or relatively limited.

The CHAIRMAN. Could somebody give that answer?

Mr. PEET. We will develop an answer for you and submit it for the record, if you wish, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

(The information requested is as follows:)

Of those summer NYC projects where the Department of Labor could identify possible involvement in conservation programs, it was reported that an estimated 4,000 enrollees were engaged in some type of conservation work on Federal, State, county, tribal or local lands in the summer of 1968. Of these, figures available at the Departments of Agriculture and Interior indicate that perhaps approximately 600 were engaged in conservation work on Federal lands.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is important here, particularly at this time when there is such a backlog of maintenance work needing to be performed in our national forests. Additionally, our national parks and



recreation areas need both operational and maintenance assistance. All of these areas are administered by the Departments of Interior or Agriculture. I would think that the Federal Government would want to give the highest priority to meeting some of the needs for their own programs that are way behind.

Senator JORDAN.

Senator JORDAN. No questions.

Senator FANNIN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Fannin.

Senator FANNIN. The problem, as I see it, is whether or not we can do more for the same amount or less money through other types of endeavors. I am thinking now of my State of Arizona where we have a large Indian population. I think it would be far more advantageous, both from the standpoint of the conservation program and for work in the national forests, to utilize these young Indian youngsters.

Here we have thousands of them within the State. I am concerned. Do you feel that this bill would properly utilize the resources of these youngsters?

Mr. PEET. Senator, I think you missed part of my presentation and this dealt with the five points of concern that the administration had on the bill.

One of these relates to the short period of time that the person would actually be enrolled. Another relates to the cost-benefit of this approach for landscaping or forest work as compared to other approaches. Another of our concerns dealt with safety. There is no safety provision in this bill. You could not operate many aspects of this program under private enterprise because of the child labor laws as they relate to safety.

We concur as to the need for more programs for our youth in the outdoors and we concur in the need to conserve our natural resources. The question was whether this bill would be the best way to achieve the two goals to which the bill in its opening statement says it is devoted. Our judgment says it would not.

Senator FANNIN. I certainly agree with you that there is a better way to approach the problem we have and also to accomplish the objectives. We have to look at this from the standpoint of the work to be accomplished and also from the benefits to the youth. I know that we have had the youngsters brought from New York, New Jersey, from many different Eastern States all the way out to Arizona to perform services that could have been performed by youth already in the State. Then, if we look at it from the standpoint of the disadvantaged, probably the most disadvantaged youth in our Nation are on Indian reservations.

So we want to take an approach both from the standpoint of being of assistance to our youngsters and also from the standpoint of the accomplishments. Would you agree that much more could be done by utilizing the people that live there and also would contribute to their future? Many of these Indian youngsters will work in forestry activities so it would be far better to train them through this medium than to bring youth from far away who would probably never be involved in forestry work.

Mr. PEET. This is very much the position we have on the conservation centers at the present time. The need is to have them established

locally, to serve the local community. Insofar as the Indian population is concerned, I mentioned one other thing. That was on the economic criteria. This bill as now written says that the enrollees shall be selected without regard to economic status, which means it would not be devoted to the hard-core poor. There would be an absolute prohibition against looking at their income level as a criterion of selection which would probably work against the group you are referring to.

Senator FANNIN. I notice that you brought out the geographical location. I would think this would be very important because when we are talking about the cost of bringing those youngsters out from the far Eastern States to the West we are spending even more on transportation than what is mentioned in your statement.

Mr. PEET. Thank you, sir.

Senator JORDAN (presiding). Senator Hatfield?

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Peet, on top of page 3 of your testimony you say, "It is estimated that the program proposed by this bill would cost at least \$1,000 per enrollee."

Mr. PEET. Yes, sir.

Senator HATFIELD. As compared to the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs of about \$400 per enrollee.

Do you consider the dollar cost the only criterion for measuring the worth of the program?

Mr. PEET. No, sir. Our point was that under this approach it would cost approximately \$1,000 per person served. Under the NYC approach it would cost approximately \$400 per person served. Therefore, for the same number of dollars you could reach twice as many people on an alternative approach.

Senator HATFIELD. Do I understand, too, that you feel that the NYC program has greater diversification than the proposed bill here of a Youth Conservation Corps, and therefore could well serve a broader number of people in their particular skills or lack of skills and their interest needs?

Mr. PEET. While this would be true, the NYC does have a very diverse type of activity covering a whole host of activities. This bill would be restricted to the forest lands, but we are not taking issue with that.

Senator HATFIELD. I just wanted to point out that I am glad that you said you did not use the costs per enrollee as the sole criterion because I think it is difficult to measure the true value or worth of the program purely on the cost per person served.

I am mindful of our experience when we established a work project for welfare workers under general welfare assistance in Oregon and some of my welfare commissioners said it would cost more money to put them to work than to give them the pure dole check each month.

As you recall, we did put them to work under a work project program and they built public parks. If we had called in skilled craftsmen, it would probably have been a lesser cost to build these parks than using general assistance welfare people, but at the same time we had a greater value, I think, that accrued to the community generally by having the general assistance welfare people contributing something back to the community, giving themselves certain pride of workmanship, learning certain skills, and so forth.

So I am glad that you point out that you don't make your judgment purely on the financial cost per enrollee. I think some of the people



are doing that today in making their evaluation of Job Corps as to whether it has been successful or not, and I think this is again a false base or criterion upon which to make judgments as to the success or lack of success of the Job Corps.

We are dealing with different kinds of people who are coming to us with little background and sometimes we are starting behind in the ball game in order to try to catch up with some of these people.

I would just comment that I have a bill that is going to be introduced soon that deals with a broader base approach to all of our young people. In fact, it takes a new approach to all youth services and learning opportunities.

I like the concept here in this bill but I would like to see the broader base. I would like to see us be concerned enough about the young people who might be involved in training for library services or teacher-aid programs or psychiatric aid programs, professional programs as well as technical programs. I think we might find that we would have a greater economic saving here if we took a diversified approach to all youth, providing them with greater learning opportunities in many areas other than just conservation, although I believe conservation is vital. I would think our program ought to have a broader base.

I appreciate your testimony very much. I think it is in keeping with your outstanding record of public service which I have known intimately for many years.

Mr. PEET. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Stevens.

Senator STEVENS. Do I understand that you base your concept as to the use of this program to the 90-day period that is in this bill?

Mr. PEET. Partially. It is 90-day experience, but part of that 90 days of necessity would be involved in such things as orientation, tool use instruction, learning first aid, and learning woodcraft, and it would leave little time for the experience in actually doing the work. This is one of five basic problems.

Senator STEVENS. What would you think would be a minimum period if we were to have such a program?

Mr. PEET. At this point, sir, I am just not prepared to recommend a figure.

Senator STEVENS. If I understand your position in your statement, you believe from a manpower point of view if we oriented a program such as this to these young people from the ghettos that we would not have efficiency because of the length of the period; is that correct? That is one of the points?

- Mr. PEET. One of the points; yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Your people haven't addressed themselves to the question of whether there is a job to be done in the parks and forests to catch up, as far as the type of work that is contemplated by this bill, is that right?

Mr. PEET. Not as such, sir.

Senator STEVENS. I want to disagree with you very violently. Have you any children?

Mr. PEET. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. How old are they?

Mr. PEET. Seventeen, eighteen, and twenty.

Senator STEVENS. Boys?

Mr. PEET. One boy.

Senator STEVENS. It seems to me that anyone who could turn a young man loose in our country with some type of supervision, to make roads and trails in the parks and forests and monuments of Alaska, for 90 days, and give him the experience of living in the woods and at the same time contributing to the betterment of those places, that they would have an experience that probably very few children in the country ever get and these would be the particular people who would benefit from it. I am afraid that we are looking at the thing from the point of view of efficiency of the end product and not the efficiency of the program itself.

Mr. PEET. No. There isn't any question about the value of such an experience. As an Oregonian, and as one who has directed youth in the forest doing work such as this, I don't question that. That really isn't our question. There is a need as we said from the beginning for more types of experience such as this.

Senator STEVENS. I don't know if the chairman knows this. I will just tell you. I am sure you don't know it. Do you know that they bring the cabins for our forests prefabbed from Canada and probably bring them through Seattle, which helps the port there but doesn't help our forests where we have some of the greatest stands of timber in the world, and they bring our prefab cabins from Canada.

I cosponsored this bill because I hoped we would send some people there in the hope that we would develop some of the things we have in our State and from the point of view of efficiency the program envisioned by the chairman's bill would actually bring about greater efficiency in my State in the use of some of the products that are there. I just disagree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator. That is a very fine statement.

I want to say that I don't have in mind transporting youngsters from New York to the west coast to conduct work projects. There are plenty of areas in the east adjacent to the large population centers where work is needed on Federal lands.

I might mention that there are now a number of civilian conservation centers, originally built to support the Job Corps program, which are vacant all across the country. These centers are in Grants Pass, Oreg.; Parker, Ariz.; Eagle Butte, S. Dak.; Mahanomen, Minn.; Gallup, N. Mex.; Jersey City, N.J.; Lewiston, Calif.; and Medina, N.Y. So, the thought was not to spend a lot of money on transportation to move them across the country.

The whole idea is that for 90 days you try to move them into the area near where they live. It is interesting to me that with the Neighborhood Youth Corps program that nothing has been done to take these youngsters and give them an opportunity to work in the parks or in the forests which are adjacent to the large metropolitan areas. These youngsters could be rendering a service to the Federal Government. I think it would be of extreme value, but it isn't being done.

I realize you are here under a directive, and I hope you realize there is nothing personal in my remarks. It is difficult, I understand, to carry out a policy that naturally has to be laid down by the President because of budgetary stringencies. However, I do want to point out that I think it would be wise for the administration to consider this measure this year on a trial basis, to see what it can do for about \$2



million. For about \$2 million I think we could get a lot of valuable information that would be extremely useful.

I hope you will carry that message back. We appreciate having your testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bert Cole, the commissioner of public lands in the State of Washington.

Mr. Cole, we are delighted to welcome you once again to the committee. We are especially appreciative of having you testify on the pending measure. I know that you have a great deal of experience in this field, particularly during the many years you have served as commissioner of public lands for the State of Washington. I understand that you have a program that you administer in connection with the conservation of the resources that are within your jurisdiction.

We are delighted to have you and you may proceed with your statement.

Senator STEVENS. May I interrupt? I would like permission to put in the record a statement from the commissioner of natural resources of the State of Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be included in the record at this point.  
(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF THOMAS E. KELLY, COMMISSIONER OF NATURAL  
RESOURCES, STATE OF ALASKA

A program as envisioned by this bill could be highly beneficial to the Federal programs in Alaska. The refuge system in general including the Kenai National Moose Range is lagging badly in providing for increased public use. BLM's proposed White Mountains and Tangle Lakes developments would be excellent places to use the 'Corps'.

The Forest Service and the Division of Water and Harbors (State) have a program on the drawing boards under which the State provides mooring facilities and the Forest Service provides camps, trails, cabins, etc. The 'Corps' could be beneficially used in furtherance of this cooperative venture.

I doubt it would be possible insofar as this bill, but the "Corps" personnel could certainly be used on our State projects if they could be funded in some manner from federal appropriations, either through the BOR or FHA. I can think of a number of areas that we have programmed where their labors would produce a highly satisfactory result. For example, the Nancy Lake Recreation Area, the Chena River Recreation Area, the Keystone Canyon State Park, the proposed Captain Cook Recreation Area, could all be projects where the "Corps" could be used if the bill was modified to permit work on State lands.

Insofar as using the "Corps" in forest management projects, I think their prime goal would be in stand improvement work; however, perhaps they could be used in fire prevention work where the possibility of injury is minimal.

STATEMENT OF BERT L. COLE, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC LANDS  
FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. COLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Washington State Department of Natural Resources has been interested in summer employment of young people for many years. We participate in whatever Federal programs are available and, in addition, employ in excess of 350 young people each summer in our own State-financed programs. We receive many applications for each available job and generally employ the most qualified candidates. However, we do respond to requests from local courts and police authority for a limited number of positions in which to place selected problem youths.

It is important that programs of this sort be well managed and that high standards of job performance be required, because the enrollees are usually having their first formal employer-employee relationship which makes a strong and lasting impression. We find that many prominent and influential people in our State were employed in our summer crews 20 or more years ago and still recall the experience with warmth and a sympathy for conservation matters.

The number of summer job opportunities for the youth of urban and rural America is becoming severely limited as a result of technological and economic changes. Jobs no longer exist in sufficient numbers for the millions of youngsters seeking summer employment. In Washington State alone there are over 300,000 youngsters between the ages of 14 and 18 years. If only 10 percent of these youths were interested in a Job Corps opportunity, the 30,000 applicants would far exceed the scope and facilities of any existing program.

While it seems plain that the scope of the program must be limited, either by funds or by design, collectively, over the years, the participants will form a sizable nucleus. Over 14,000 have participated in our department programs since termination of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1941. In addition, over 3,300 youngsters have participated in the department-sponsored NYC program.

Our program involves a planned cross section of youth, and I urge that yours should, too. The competition by young people for summer employment is such that a youth program without controls as to who can participate would be dominated by the well adjusted, aggressive majority of American youth and would not materially assist the disadvantaged minority.

For this reason it is felt that a portion of the available positions should be reserved for problem or potentially problem youths, thereby insuring a more representative cross section of society in the enrollment. Guidelines for any socioeconomic considerations should be developed along regional lines with broad, realistic standards. A rigid, single set of standards applied nationwide will be less desirable, both in carrying out the intent of such a program and reaching the youths who are sought.

The proposed Youth Conservation Corps will involve youngsters from both rural and urban areas. The needs of each of these groups should be recognized in developing the program.

Through this program we can encourage rural youths to remain in the country rather than migrate to cities in search of employment. We can provide training in work habits and job skills which have permanent application to rural life, such as construction machine operation and maintenance, woods skills, and so forth.

The problems of urban youth are primarily environmental, coupled with enforced summer idleness. By providing a temporary change in environment and constructive employment we can direct a well-aimed blow at the core of one of the Nation's greatest urban problems, that of summer unrest.

I am convinced that a well-run youth conservation program will directly treat several social problems, while providing personal experiences to young citizens which will have a productive and lasting effect on their lives.

Based on our experience in working with young people, I would like to make several points which I think are important.



Setting up a new program of major proportions is expensive. Much of the initial high cost is in capital outlay for equipment and structures. In order to be successful, a youth conservation program must not engage in "make-work" projects or procedures. Young people are very discerning as to the worth of projects. They are idealistic and want to be productive.

Doing a job with a pick and shovel to sop up labor when the work could be better accomplished with machinery is not acceptable and does not produce the social and psychological results which constitute at least 50 percent of the benefits of such programs. The program should maximize development of skills—usable skills that will help the individual earn his future living. We have found it is better to reduce the scope of the program than to economize on equipment, such as tractors, power shovels, power saws, and so forth.

The construction of camps for use 3 months of the year is very expensive and should be undertaken only as a last resort. First, present camp facilities should be used to capacity.

The alternative to camps is the so-called home guard operation as used in the NYC program. All enrollees within 30 minutes to 1 hour travel time of designated pickup points can live at home and commute to the work via Youth Corps transport. This type of operation is infinitely less expensive than building and staffing camps for 3 months operation and can be used to advantage in the rural and semirural areas.

Having work available within travel time of 1 hour from the pickup point is, of course, the problem. In Washington State, as well as in many others, State and county lands are closer to urban areas than Federal lands. By broadening the scope of the proposed program to include State and county lands, more home guarding would be possible, resulting in an improvement of the overall cost-benefit ratio for the program.

I would suggest the committee consider inclusion in the program of at least those State lands granted by the Federal Government for support of the State's educational institutions.

Where the work is remote from available housing, we have often found small crews, quartered in mobile homes, to be a much more efficient operation for seasonal use than permanent buildings which cannot move with the work and are subject to off-season deterioration and vandalism.

In those instances where there is no alternative to camp operation, off-season uses could be made of the facilities if properly located; for example, winter sports leases to ski clubs or a commercial operator. They could be made available to school districts for regular conservation education sessions or operated as study centers for seminars and short courses offered by colleges or universities. Camps could serve as meeting centers for training programs by Federal agencies or be used to quarter winter work crews such as tree planters.

An interesting sidelight to the Youth Conservation Corps proposal is that the Corps could be used for forest stand improvement work on areas in national forests designated for timber production. This work would increase the growth rate of trees, thereby permitting an immediate increase in the sustained yield annual cut. The increased cut would increase Federal revenues and might well pay the entire Youth Corps program costs.

I am also chairman of the Land Commissioners Association Legislative Committee and it has been a policy of our Land Commissioners Association in the Western States to support such programs as this because each of us has much State land to manage and are interested in our Federal lands, and we have drawn resolutions supporting youth programs such as this in the past and certainly probably will reenforce that again at our coming meeting at Ocean Shores in the State of Washington this August.

I strongly support Senator Jackson's Youth Conservation Corps proposal.

I appreciate this opportunity, gentlemen, to appear before you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Cole, I want to thank you for a very helpful statement. You have been administering at the State level a program somewhat similar to what we have in mind for the Federal Government.

Mr. COLE. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the age groups?

Mr. COLE. Our age groups are 16 to 20, with a boy that is physically and socially able at 15 to work with them.

The CHAIRMAN. You have some at 15?

Mr. COLE. I would say we have about 60 boys each year who are 15.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your experience as far as productivity of these youngsters is concerned?

Mr. COLE. Well, the morale is exceedingly high. What we have is a Mom and Pop situation. We provide the cook to cook the food. The boys pay for the food out of their checks. This gives them an appreciation that food costs money, and it gives them a planning group to plan with the cook so that they are not eating steak every meal. It is kind of interesting.

The first week they eat one steak every night, and the cook tells them, "We can have some baked beans or tunafish and noodles and your money will go further," and the boys recognize this after a period of time. These are some economic and social values that dramatize these Mom and Pop situations.

The man is generally skilled in work and likes young people. He is skilled in trail work, the use of axe and tools, power saws, and other equipment and we have a repeat in our groups. We have a vacancy for about 200 boys each year because we get some repeats.

Many of the leaders in our State, in fact one of the top executives in the Bell Telephone System, worked three summers with our suppression crew or youth crew.

The CHAIRMAN. Fire suppression?

Mr. COLE. Yes, that is what we call this program. That is, their primary responsibility is to be prepared to fight fire, and once they are trained to do that in about 10 days, then they clean up picnic areas, develop picnic areas, develop trails, open up culverts, roads and such.

This program, Senator, has been very, very helpful to practically all the youth who have enrolled in it. We have taken many boys that the school counselor has suggested that we handle for some social adjustment and some of the judges have recommended the same.

The CHAIRMAN. As part of a probation arrangement?



Mr. COLE. No, we don't take anybody into this that has had any trouble with the courts. He might be about to have trouble with the courts. As you well know, we have our honor camp program which we manage for youth.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a separate program.

Mr. COLE. It is separate for the court cases, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have found that these youngsters can make a real contribution in the conservation of State lands?

Mr. COLE. The work accomplishment is tremendous each year. They thin areas, do roadside beautification on our timber stands, prune trees and clean up the brush so that you have this beauty aspect, and the important thing is that we are increasing the wood fiber growth on that stand of State timberland.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to compliment you on a very fine statement. I think it answers a lot of questions by reason of your own experience in a program that is somewhat comparable to the program we are considering today. I assume that other land commissioners have somewhat similar programs.

Mr. COLE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it 22 States that have public lands?

Mr. COLE. We have 22 Western States, including Texas up to North Dakota and then west, including Alaska and Hawaii. All of the States don't have as intensive programs. Most of us that have these programs have sizable amounts of forest land, Idaho, Montana, Washington, Oregon.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator Allott.

Senator ALLOTT. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Jordan.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Bert, I have a high regard for your work in conservation and the good job you are doing over in the neighboring State of Washington. I am pleased to hear our testimony. I would like to ask you a few more questions about it.

How many boys do you have in your program in the summer?

Mr. COLE. About 500. This includes the suppression crew, our NYC people that the Federal Government and the State are working with in our State lands, and the engineering and forestry aids that we have and so forth.

Senator JORDAN. How much do you pay them?

Mr. COLE. We start them out at \$300 a month. The fire suppression crew is the lowest base of \$300. Out of this he must pay his food bill.

Senator JORDAN. What size crews do you break them into? You mentioned a mom-and-pop situation? What size squads do you have?

Mr. COLE. There are 20 in the largest group. We have tens and some fives. They are mostly tens and twenties.

Senator JORDAN. What is the youngest age that you have had experience with in these camps?

Mr. COLE. The individual? Fifteen years.

Senator JORDAN. Fifteen years. What is the incidence of dropout during the summer of the boys that you have had?

Mr. COLE. It will run about 5 percent I would say, very, very low. It is surprisingly low. It generally comes because of a discipline prob-

lem. He wants to take his car out during the week and we have a rule that you turn your car key in when you come Sunday night and it is hung up and you don't get it back until your release to go home on Friday night or Saturday. Thus, discipline is a minor problem.

Senator JORDAN. That is unusually low. How would you explain the reason why your incidence of dropout is so low compared to the dropout rate in Job Corps where the boys are older?

Mr. COLE. We have about 30 applicants for each job.

Senator JORDAN. It is competition for the jobs?

Mr. COLE. They are interviewed by the District Administrator in which area he is going to work. We have a printed set of rules and standards and they are told that they are to get up at 7 o'clock in the morning and are to be on the job at 8. All these things are understood clearly before they come. Many boys who apply to us Senator, don't come back for a job because we demand some high standards, but the point I think is that, because of this opportunity, we have made better citizens out of many of these young people.

Senator JORDAN. There is no question about that. How much do you use the home guard concept, boys living at home and taking them in buses to work and back home again at night?

Mr. COLE. We just started that, sir, 3 years ago. It required a radio communication network system because the boys that we hire are on duty 5 days a week, 24 hours a day, as you don't know when a fire is going to start. You actually work 8 hours and if you work over that you get some compensatory time. But it is working very nicely now in some cases, particularly in our more rural areas rather than in the metropolitan areas of Everett and Seattle and Tacoma. Those boys seem to do a better job by being in one of our camps rather than the home guard.

Senator JORDAN. When you speak of a camp, I gather you are speaking about lumber housing, more or less of a permanent type. Have you had any experience with these boys in tent camps?

Mr. COLE. We use tent camps, sir, and we also use trailers where we can move the crew around. We have 20-some-odd trailers in our organization that we use for various types of administrative work and in the summertime they have a high priority for our youth programs.

Senator JORDAN. It seems to me that the capital cost could be held down to a minimum by either using tent camps or renting trailers or owning a few. This might help make more money available to the actual paying of these boys, wouldn't it?

Mr. COLE. I am a firm believer of that. I think in the summertime, as you well know, our weather is such that it is not too convenient. We do use the surplus squad tent that we use in our Project Fires, as I stated, for some camps, but we do have permanent facilities at each of our 24 headquarters throughout the State for from 5- to 20-man crews as a base.

We have asked the legislature to give us more funds because we have more boys seeking jobs and the pressure on our public lands by the public for recreation is increasing so rapidly that we need more manpower to keep them clean and keep them up and develop new areas for recreational use.

Senator JORDAN. I think the experience has been very good in my State. We have more boys wanting to go than we have room for.



Mr. COLE. That is right. Oregon and Washington and Idaho have programs that we can be proud of.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you, Bert.

Senator FANNIN. Mr. Cole, we are pleased to see you here this morning. I know that you have a very outstanding record in this activity as well as in your work on public lands and land conservation, and in many other areas. I know that Art Messer is very fond of you and you work closely with him.

In your testimony I was very impressed with what you said especially concerning the results that have been achieved. I was just wondering if you could achieve more in a program if you had additional funds, say Federal funds, to assist what you are doing at the state level rather than to go to a program such as is incorporated in this bill.

Mr. COLE. Well, sir, that is true, but I think what we are talking about here is that there is so much need on your Federal lands, too, as well as our lands. As you notice, in my testimony, I said we would like to have some more financial help. We need help to meet our needs, and I think, at least in our State, our national forest and national park and national recreation areas are needful of much trail work and much work that these boys could be doing.

Senator FANNIN. I agree, but couldn't that be a cooperative program so that it could be supervised by the State?

Mr. COLE. Contract with us, is what you are saying?

Senator FANNIN. Yes; because it was estimated here that the cost would be \$1,000 per enrollee, and they say that compares with the cost of about \$400 per enrollee incurred last summer and expected next summer in the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. Perhaps we haven't done enough in the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, but I agree with the objectives and am concerned with how we can do that.

I am very concerned about the State of Arizona doing more for our Indian youngsters. Their training and the discipline and all is helpful but also, for their futures, many of them could be involved in the forest industry activities and this would be training.

I notice that you say you have approximately 300,000 youngsters approximately 15 to 18 years of age and if only 10 percent of these youth participated in Job Corps activity the number would exceed the scope of any existing program. How many would you estimate are in all the programs involved in the State now?

Mr. COLE. I think, sir, we must have close to the neighborhood of 1,000 with our game management lands and with our State parks and with the city programs. We probably have close to a thousand young people, which is just a small amount.

Senator FANNIN. But even with this legislation I don't know just how many we could reach and what the appropriation would be, but I am looking at it from the standpoint of how we could better accomplish the objective.

I agree with the objective, but I don't know whether or not we could do it better through the program outlined in the bill or do it better through working with the agencies that are now involved and that have had success. I realize that not all of the States have had your success or the success that Senator Jordan has explained they have had

in Idaho, and I know we have had some success in Arizona. I am not entirely satisfied, but we do have some other "mom and pop" program situations that you speak of that have been very helpful, such as ranch programs and things of that nature.

Mr. COLE. Yes.

Senator FANNIN. I would like to have your thoughts as to whether or not we might do more if we could coordinate the State efforts to a greater extent, with support funds coming from the Federal Government, and accomplish these objectives through State agencies and through a coordinated effort.

Mr. COLE. I would certainly hope that there would be an opportunity for contractual opportunities where States are doing such a good job. Actually we are all working for the same group and trying to face the same problem. We ought to be working mutually on it. I get the point that Senator Jackson desires to do something for these young people and at the same time try to help the work that needs to be done on our national lands, but if we can do it by contracting with the State, I would certainly agree.

Senator FANNIN. As I stated, we all agree with the objective and certainly I am very strongly in favor of a program that will reach what you have said is the objective, a two-way street, both the accomplishments and also the training of the youth and working with the youth in a way that he understands that he is accomplishing something that is needed.

I notice you emphasize that to be successful the youth conservation program must not engage in make-work projects or procedures. I think you realize that in the Job Corps that we have had very many programs that have just been make-work programs or projects and they have not given the youngster the confidence and also not given him the experience that he needs. That is what I am really concerned about in this bill.

I feel that you have helped considerably to provide a better understanding of what can be done and, also, how it can be done, but I still am desirous of delving more into the matter of whether or not we can have just exactly what you are talking about, a contractual program of some nature. In attempting that, if it proves successful, it would, I think, be at much less cost and in most instances have the youths close to their homes and many times in activities in which they could develop their future work.

Mr. COLE. It would suit us in the State of Washington to have that philosophy, sir.

Senator FANNIN. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you again, Mr. Cole, for a very fine statement and one that I think will be extremely useful to the committee.

Our last two witnesses this morning are Mrs. Elizabeth Titus and Mr. John Dolstad.

I want to say for the benefit of my colleagues that Mr. Dolstad is employed as an administrator for Seattle District No. 1 and has been a teacher and counselor in the schools in Seattle since 1951. He has been the person in charge of administering the Student Conservation Association program, at both Mount Rainier, and I believe, Olympic National Park.

Mr. Dolstad paid his own way here and is very much interested in the youngsters.



Mrs. Titus, I believe you are the president of the Student Conservation Association, Inc. Your residence is where?

Mrs. TITUS. It is in Oyster Bay, Long Island.

The CHAIRMAN. Oyster Bay, Long Island. Are you related to Teddy Roosevelt?

Mrs. TITUS. No, but we work at Teddy Roosevelt's home. That is where our office is.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Titus, would you proceed now in your own way, and then we will hear from Mr. Dolstad. You might just explain your organization. I think it is very interesting.

#### STATEMENT OF MRS. ELIZABETH TITUS, PRESIDENT, STUDENT CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mrs. TITUS. Thank you, Senator.

My name is Elizabeth Titus, and I am president of the Student Conservation Association, Inc., a nonprofit membership organization, whose headquarters are at Sagamore Hill National Historic Site, Oyster Bay, N.Y.

We have been operating successfully since 1957 the student conservation program for high school, college, and graduate men and women. These students, selected from all parts of this country, and even from abroad, volunteer their services to work and learn as members of the student conservation program in, at this point, 20 national parks and national forests in various parts of this country.

With me to testify in support of Senator Jackson's bill is Mr. John Dolstad, who, with his wife, has supervised the high school SCP wilderness program in Olympic National Park since 1958.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate very much the opportunity of being asked to testify in favor of S. 1076. You are certainly providing the much needed leadership in this vital field.

We have been working on this concept of tapping our youth's energy in accomplishing much needed work in our national parks while at the same time giving opportunity to each student to broaden his knowledge of conservation through field experience. The student conservation program started out on a trial project basis in 1957 in two national parks—Olympic and Grand Teton National Parks. The program at the beginning was under the sponsorship of the National Parks Association and had the support from other such organizations as the Garden Club of America, the Wilderness Society, the Audubon Society, and from such foundations as the Conservation Foundation and the Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc. Since then the support from foundations has expanded to include Ford, American Conservation, and the Old Dominion Foundations, to name a few, to show the interest and support of many people in this type of endeavor.

The program is organized on three different levels—one for the high school age who work in the wilderness program; the second for the college and graduate students who work as park and forest service assistants; and the third are the graduate-level students who do much needed research which the park area wishes to have accomplished.

This past summer alone approximately 140 volunteer SCP students gave over 28,000 hours of labor on National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service lands. By the end of this summer there will have been

approximately 1,000 students who will have been members of this program, from more than 40 States and currently living in nine foreign countries.

The part of our program which will be of most interest today is the wilderness program. These students are 16-18 years old, and until this summer, when we are offering a trial project for girls as well, has been for boys alone. These students apply to the association to work in a park area. Because there are so many students who wish this unique opportunity, the selection committee basically chooses those students with leadership qualities and who are well motivated toward this type of endeavor.

They are placed in the park of the student's choice along with 14 other high school age boys and a well qualified husband and wife team who are the SCP work and camp supervisors.

At this point there are four park and forest areas where these programs operate—Olympic, Mount Rainier in Washington State, the Great Smoky Mountains in Tennessee, and the Merck Forest-Green Mountain National Forest areas in Vermont. In each of these areas there are usually two such SCP camps in operation during the summer—one in July and the other in August.

The students receive their board and lodging from the association. And for those students who otherwise could not participate, we offer travel scholarships as well on a limited basis. The students build trails, shelters, rehabilitate overused campsites, and do other such work needed to be done which otherwise could not be accomplished. Different persons, not only from the National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service, but also from universities and leading conservation organizations, and personages such as Justice Douglas, hike in and see the students and share their knowledge with them about the ecology of the area, et cetera.

Students also learn about their environment and methods in which they can help in their local communities when they return home to improve and protect their areas as well. Some students have set up conservation clubs and groups in their schools and churches; others have gone into the National Park Service or U.S. Forest Service with permanent or seasonal positions; still others are in the Peace Corps, stationed throughout the world. Many are attaining leadership in various fields, including the teaching field, and so they can disseminate information where needed and inspire others to help in this vital field.

The following are comments from some of the students, showing that these students feel that this type of program mentioned in this bill is not only needed but these students welcome this opportunity.

One boy mentioned:

I loved it. I enjoyed the work, the camping, and the hiking. Not only did we get a good deal of work done, but we also learned about the wilderness and the purpose of our national parks. I believe that the SCP is an experience that every teenager should enjoy. It is an experience that I shall remember the rest of my life. Even though it rained, hailed, got cold and rough, I enjoyed every minute of it.

The knowledge gained in the areas of ecology, woodsmanship, geography and fraternity, as well as the new knowledge of and respect for Park Service and conservation will be an asset to me all my life. I only hope the program can be expanded in the number of boys and parks, so more people and areas can benefit in the future.

I feel that the program has been very beneficial to all of us who have participated. We had much satisfaction knowing that we could work together as a group and accomplish something, not only what we can be proud of, but knowing that we were helping America at the same time.



The SCA has done a tremendous job in building a program, which, judging from my own experience seven years ago, is of tremendous benefit to anyone who takes part in it. This same feeling was expressed to me by the late Admiral C. W. Nimitz, a benefactor of the program with whom I have corresponded.

These are just the types of quotes made by these students showing that there is a willingness and desire for what is unfortunately limited to a relatively few students. The effect of this S. 1076 would be to make this valuable experience available to a very much wider group of young people. It is because of this that we are very heartily endorsing the bill S. 1076.

I do appreciate very much this opportunity to be asked to be here today, and Mr. John Dolstad also has a statement at this time.

I do want to say that Mr. Dolstad has worked with this program for 12 years in Olympic National Park and has done not only an outstanding job there, but I feel that his comments would be very valuable.

Senator JORDAN (presiding). Before we interrogate you about your very interesting statement, I think we should hear Mr. Dolstad.

#### STATEMENT OF JOHN DOLSTAD, STUDENT CONSERVATION PROGRAM, OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

Mr. DOLSTAD. I think I will have my statement printed as a part of the record and pick out what I think is significant from the testimony this morning and also express my reaction to the administration witnesses.

Senator JORDAN. It will be printed in full at the end of your remarks.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I am a private citizen, not an administration witness, and I feel that I have something to offer you in terms of reacting to the administrations views. The thing that seems most important to me is that in this bill your are combining two major problem areas in the country in the natural resources field into the one bill. That is to improve the Federal lands by using the restless American youth.

I think it should be used and can be used, and to me 90 days is a long time. You put a young person out in one of these areas, and one of the main differences in the aims of our program and the Senate one, No. 1076, is that ours is only 3 weeks, and I see vast growth in these young people in 3 weeks. I see so much growth that I am willing to come here and testify and say that more young people should be involved.

I can't quite understand why 90 days is such a short period of time. If you get out in the mountains and wilderness, sometimes 2 days is quite an experience for you.

When we established our student conservation program, certain things were necessary to make sure that it would work, and some of the questions asked today were questions that were asked of us; namely, was a Federal agency interested in having such a program, both from the top administrative level and in the field?

We found that the Department of the Interior was very much interested. The work that had been done during the CCC days had not even been maintained.

For instance, in Olympic National Park many of the trails before World War II were not even opened up after World War II, much less maintained for visitor use, so that many trails in Olympic have denied access to visitors at a time when greater use is now being made of the park.

We wondered whether young people would be willing to volunteer their services, and we found an overwhelming response to this. Even though we thought maybe it was wishful thinking by the older generation, young people do want to volunteer. They are idealistic, as Mr. Cole suggested, and want to be used and needed.

The other question by one of the administration witnesses was, could they use tools? Most of these young people who come to us have never used an ax, much less a chain saw. They have never used a tool for building.

I have with me some pictures for you to see. These young people do build shelters. They do excellent trail work. They work harder than most adults. They don't know what a coffee break is. They really don't even know what a working day is. They spend a lot of time, and they are diligent. They want to prove themselves. I know they are effective, because for 12 years the Park Service has been very eager to have us come back year after year. We have not hurt the park staffs. We work with the Park Service during their peak season. And, believe me, gentlemen, if we weren't effective and didn't do something of value, the Park Service would not have us there. Furthermore, we are gaining many real park supporters. They learn to love the park by living in it.

They say a picture is worth a thousand words, but it seems to me that actually being on location is worth a thousand pictures, and this is what I want our young people to experience. I feel so strongly about this that that is why I am here today.

I further would like to react to the idea that it should be open to all American youth. I think that programs for the poverty areas are very necessary. I think programs for all the disadvantaged are necessary, but I think programs for all youth are just as necessary, and I think a mixture is very necessary, because, otherwise, they don't learn about each other. If you have a ghetto community and it doesn't have a chance to see the other community, you don't think of people as individuals. By getting out in the wilderness together, each young person stands on his own.

I think it is extremely important that he is thought of as an individual with his own strengths and weaknesses, and the wilderness will do this for him. That is also part of the record.

The one other thing that I would like to comment about is that while the Senator was drafting the bill a group of Seattle outdoor enthusiasts, among them Jim Whittaker, and other central area counselors thought of a program for the central area youth, and I would also like to make that as a part of the record.

(The document referred to follows:)

## CENTRAL AREA OUTDOOR EDUCATION PROGRAM

### INTRODUCTION

This project is designed to give Central Area boys of junior high school age (13-15) a chance to live outside the heart of the city in a wilderness environment. The project is specifically aimed at youths who are having problems in school and in the community.

### OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this project are to give these boys a chance to have a fresh look at life, a chance to live away from pavement and buildings, crowded streets and smokey air. This wilderness experience will put them into a healthful and inspiring situation away from the pressures of a fast moving, complex urban life.



They will be taught how to live in natural surroundings, how to build a camp-fire and cook a meal of clams which they dug from the ocean beach. They will learn that there is more than one way to live. They will be given a chance to re-evaluate the city life they came from.

#### ORGANIZATION

The program will be organized as a non-profit corporation under the laws of the State of Washington. Steps will be taken to qualify it as a charitable and educational organization under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Such qualification will make contributions and gifts given the corporation deductible for federal income tax purposes.

The corporation will have a board of directors, officers, executive committee, and principal employees following the usual form. All appropriate filing and reporting requirements will be met.

#### CAMP PARTICULARS

##### 1. Session

Regular camp activities will last six weeks, beginning June 26 and ending August 14th.

There will be a counselor training period from June 16th through June 24th at the campsites.

##### 2. Participants and Recruitment

300 boys ages 13-15 will be recruited starting March 15th, if the project is approved by then.

The recruiters will go to Meany and Washington Junior High Schools and obtain names of students from school records, working with faculty and counselors. These boys will then be interviewed and signed up. Records of all interviews will be kept for staff reference.

##### 3. Grouping of boys

The basic unit will consist of eight boys. These boys will be grouped according to maturity (mental and physical) so that each group contains individuals who will be closely similar in ability. Each party of eight will have a counselor. The counselor and his eight boys will stay together for the entire six weeks. This will provide a close-knit body that can function as a unit. Also the counselor will become close to each of his boys. This strong personal relationship will be the backbone of the camp.

##### 4. Sites

There will be six sites. Five will be on the Olympic Peninsula within a three-hour drive of each other. The sixth site will be on one of the San Juan Islands, possibly one of those mentioned below. The five peninsula sites will be well away from any communities or highways and will preferably be located on State or federal land. Leases or permits will be obtained.

##### *List of site examples*

(a) Hood Canal: Comparable to Camp Parsons, Camp Robinswold.

(b) San Juan Islands:

Sucia.

Cypress (Boy Scouts of America site, east side of island.)

(c) Mountain Site—Olympics:

Soleduc—Hoh (pack horses).

Enchanted Valley.

Humes Ranch.

(d) Lake Site:

Lake Crescent.

Dickey Lake (?).

(e) Ocean Site:

Ozette.

Beach—3 (South of Lapush).

Oil City (North side mouth of Hoh—Latrines).

Mouth of Quinault.

Toliak Point (two cabins)—cabin needs work.

Each of the six sites will be set up to accommodate six parties of eight boys, or 48 boys and six counselors. This will include cooking utensils, food, tents, or plastic shelters for all, water, washing and toilet facilities, medicine and first aid

equipment, and any other equipment that is instrumental in the carrying out of the particular site functions, e.g., life jackets, life lines, shovels, etc. A permanent counselor or specialist will remain at each site for the whole summer. He will be in charge of that site's activities. A young married couple might serve. For example at a mountain site the counselor will offer a selection of hikes where each group may go for the day. One group (of eight) to fish a stream, another to clear logs off a certain trail, another to learn how to traverse a glacier or snow field, etc. He will provide tools or camping gear when needed from his store of goods. All goods will be returned to him and remain at the site.

#### *One week at each site*

The boys will stay at each site about one week, then move on to another. They will move to a new site every week of the session. There will be no more than a three-hour drive to jumping off places from which each site can be reached.

#### *5. Side trips*

The boys will be taken on day trips from their base sites on occasion. They may travel in eight-man parties or as 2, 3, or 4 parties together. Buses or station wagons will be provided when necessary.

##### *Examples of side trips*

- (a) Visit a farm and observe workings of the day, milking, feeding stock, etc.
- (b) Visit a logging operation, watch felling of trees, loading, etc., perhaps participate in clean-up of slash.
- (c) Visit a salmon cannery, watch boats being unloaded.
- (d) Visit Bush Prairie, homestead of first black in the North West.

#### *6. Transportation between sites*

(a) Buses will take the boys from the city to the various camp sites. The counselors will accompany their eight-man parties. One or two large buses will be kept on hand throughout the summer along with one or two smaller vans that can carry up to ten people.

When the week ends and the boys must move on to the next site the "on-hand" buses and vans will meet the group which has the farthest distance to cover. It will be remembered that every site can be reached from every other site by a maximum drive of three hours so several groups could be moved in one day. Also, some groups can hike from one site to the next. For example, the mountain site and the Hood Canal site might conceivably exchange all 48 boys by incorporating over-night hiking. (See diagram). There are infinite ways of juggling this transportation of boys, including charter buses that come for the weekend only for special moves.

(b) Charter boat: This boat would be chartered for the weekend moves *only* (two days for the round trip to Sucia or Cypress). It would take the boys from Port Angeles to Sucia or Cypress, drop them off and return in six days to take them back. This boat must hold at least 55 people and have facilities (not over-night) for eating, etc. It is emphasized that this boat or boats would, while giving the boys an "on the water experience" be chartered for transportation only—while in use. It will not be chartered for the whole summer.

Alternatives would be to take the ferries from Port Angeles to Victoria—through the San Juans, with a short haul to Cypress or Sucia from Orcas, San Juan or Anacortes, whichever was the most convenient.

For example, this is the first move following one week of camp. This move is done all by bus, no hiking. Early morning, 6:00 a.m., buses pick up boys at ocean site and drive them to point where #1 mountain site boys wait. Buses drop off ocean site boys who will hike in to #1 mountain site. Buses pick up boys from #1 mountain site and take them to lake site, switch again and do this all along until the buses reach the Hood Canal site, then take the Hood Canal boys all the way back to ocean site. Total time (without any unforeseen delays) including short waits at each stop and loading and unloading is nine hours. This puts the Hood Canal boys at ocean site by 3:00 p.m. with plenty of time to hike to the beach and set up camp.

Emergency plans would have to be made in case one group did not make it to the rendezvous point.

Back-up transportation arrangements would be provided in case of equipment failure.



## STAFF

1. *Board of Directors and professional advisory group*

This body will act as a policy making and program content board. It will guide the executive-secretary and the entire project. There will also be a professional advisory body.

Membership of these two groups will be drawn from persons such as the following:

- (a) David C. Black:
  - 11 years secondary school teaching.
  - 7 summers conducting five-week private camping trips—Vagabonds—boys aged 12–16.
  - Director of Lower School, Lakeside School, Seattle.
  - Member, North West Outward Bound Committee.
- (b) Jack Dolstad:
  - Director, 11 years Student Conservation Program, Olympic National Park.
  - Director, Outdoor Education, Seattle Public Schools.
  - Conservation Committee, Seattle Mountaineers.
  - Olympic Parks Association.
  - North Cascades Conservation Council.
  - Wilderness Society.
- (c) Nick Fahey:
  - Educated in Central Area schools.
  - President, Garfield class of 1961.
  - Ski instructor, Crystal Mountain
  - Ski instructor, University of Washington
  - Ski instructor, Fiorini
  - Graduate, University of Washington.
  - One year study France, Grenoble.
  - General Manager of Faler Camp, a Wyoming year-round resort (horse packing, dudes, hunting, skiing.)
  - Assistant, ski area consultant.
  - Experience in woodsmanship, boat handling, hiking, etc.
- (d) Charles P. Huey:
  - 10 years work with Central Area youth.
  - President of the Central Area Youth Association.
  - Director of the Community Talent Bank.
  - 2 years Garfield High School working with students.
  - Manager, semi-professional baseball team—Seattle.
  - Consultant, Battelle Seattle Research Center.
  - Has children in Seattle schools.
- (e) John C. Little:
  - Year work with Central Area youth.
  - Assistant Director, Community Talent Bank.
  - Treasurer, Central Area Youth Association.
  - Consultant, Battelle Seattle Research Center.
  - Has children in Seattle schools.
- (f) O. L. Mitchell:
  - 8½ years Seattle Park and Recreation Department.
  - 9 years in junior athletics.
  - 1 year summer camp YMCA.
  - 3 years Seattle schools, helping problem children of the Central Area.
  - Eastside YMCA Health and Physical Planning.
  - 10 years in athletics in Seattle.
- (g) Palmer Smith:
  - 2 semesters teaching near dropouts at Garfield High School.
  - Observer and Reporter, Community Talent Bank.
  - Consultant, Battelle Seattle Research Center.
  - Seattle attorney.
  - Experienced outdoorsman and woodsman.
  - Married, with children in Seattle schools.
- (h) Harry Truman:
  - 30 years in North West camping.
  - Director of B.S.A. camps, church camps, and YMCA camps.
  - 23 years operator of Hidden Valley Camp in Snohomish County, a coeducational camp.

## (i) Ken Van Dyke:

- 1 year Roosevelt High School—Latin teacher.
- 3 years Nathan Hale—Latin, English, Spanish and class adviser class of 1966.
- 3 years Lakeside—Latin:
  - Student court adviser.
  - Class adviser, class of 1969.
  - Coach, football and squash.
- 1 summer, Lakeside Educational Enrichment Program (for Central Area boys of promise).
- 3 years Boy Scout counselling.
- 6 years counselling with CYO camps under Gordie Hamilton.
- Director, Camp Latona, Gambier Island, B.C. under Catholic Youth Association, Vancouver, B.C.
- 3 years Assistant Director, Vagabond.
- Director, Westward Ho Camp for Boys.
- 5 years Ski Instructor.
- Member, Phi Delta Kappa educational honorary.
  - Seattle Committee Northwest Outward Bound School.
  - American Camping Association.
  - Catholic Youth Organization, Camp Board of Directors.
- 5 years Director "Thomas More" Hall, residence for high school students. Mountaineer.

## (j) Jim Whittaker:

- Graduate of Seattle University.
- Mount Rainier Guide.
- Manager of Recreational Equipment, Inc.
- Trustee, Robert F. Kennedy Memorial.
- Trustee, Kontum Hospital.
- Member, State Park and Recreation Commission.
- Logistics and Equipment Officer, 1963 American Everest Expedition.
- First American to climb Everest.
- Recipient Hubbard Award, John F. Kennedy.
- Recipient Ten Outstanding Young Men Award 196s—by Junior Chamber of Commerce.
- Participant F.O.C.U.S. program.
- Member, National Council B.S.A.
- Member, National Park Service Advisory Board.

Other persons who can contribute will be asked to join the board of directors or professional advisory group.

2. *Executive Director*

The project will be headed by an executive director who will be in charge of staffing the entire operation, procuring and equipping sites, making arrangements with local officials and services for permission and permits. He will oversee all operations and be responsible for their carrying out.

*Qualifications of executive director*

He should be a person who will present himself well to the Central Area community, especially to the blacks. He should also be a person who will be able to stand up to any groups who should try to question this project. A black man would be preferable, especially if he had a military background. He need not have extensive outdoor experience as this can be supplied by his assistants and field personnel.

3. *Executive assistant*

One or two men who will serve as assistants to the executive director and aid him in the various aspects of the project. One of these men should be very experienced in procurement and contract negotiation.

4. *Training of site managers and counselors*(a) *Preliminary training*(1) *Lectures*—qualified specialists drawn from—

- Board of Directors.
- Experienced professional counselors.
- Mountaineers.
- Red Cross, King County Health Department, University of Washington Medical School.



U.S. Forest—Park Service—Department of Natural Resources—Fish & Game Department.  
University of Washington.  
Mountain Rescue Council.

(2) Mid-week evening lectures and demonstrations to begin in groups of six or more as soon as six are hired.

(3) They will earn pay for this training.

(4) Courses given in first aid, sanitation, the Black History of the West, boating, swimming, fire prevention, woodsmanship, wilderness construction, ecology, shore oceanography, etc.

*(b) Intensive Training (pre-program)*

(1) Spring period of lectures succeeded by an intensive on-site training period of ten days, June 16th–24th.

(2) During this period all counselors will visit all sites and will work with the local Forest and Park Service staffs and the staffs of State Agencies exploring and becoming generally familiar with the hinterland behind and around each site.

(3) All counselors and the executive director and his supporting staff will become closely acquainted with each other under field conditions.

(4) There will be standard drills and procedures to meet such emergencies as:

Fire

Sickness

Missing boy

Equipment breakdown

Back-up procedures will be provided for.

*(c) In-service training*

(1) Further training and site specialties will be carried on at each site.

(2) In-service training of counselors will be carried on at the same time as the boys are learning. Site directors will provide this training appropriate with the site.

*(d) Themes of training (major themes)*

Designed to develop in counselors added qualities of good instructors who will challenge but not overtax boys in his group—he should be able to maintain discipline yet build boys' self-respect and reach them. It is essential that these men be strong so as not to compete with the kids—strong enough to keep order and inspire healthy team spirit.

*5. Site managers*

(a) Six in all—they will be men over 25 years, experienced in outdoor recreation. They may have their families with them at the site. Married couples without children will be preferred. They will be responsible for food and equipment at their site and, with the counselors, for the entire group of boys who are at the site at any time.

(b) During session he is responsible for:

*(1) Site logistics:*

Shelter

Food

Fuel

Communications

Sanitation

Water

Equipment maintenance

System of gear control

*(2) Programs (site)*

Scheduling basic site routines

Emergency procedures

Work programs

In-service training

Periodic drills to meet emergencies (fire, sickness). These are to be combined with in-service training of counselors and boys in wilderness training in such matters as first aid, water safety.

*6. Counselors*

(a) 42 in all, 36 regulars and 6 substitutes who will relieve the regulars once a week on rotating days.

(b) Each counselor will be assigned eight boys whom he will be directly responsible for and in charge of at all times.

(c) A counselor shall have the following qualifications:

(1) He must be at least 19 years old, but should probably be older, perhaps later college or beyond, or from selected young school teachers who enjoy outdoor life.

(2) He must be susceptible of absorbing training in areas in which he must learn new skills.

(3) He may be black or white, however a balance of 50-50 is desirable in the counselor group.

(d) Counselors will be recruited. Their selection and the experience behind their selection will be critical to the success of the program. They must be very high caliber people, well rounded, stable, resolute.

#### *7. Logistic personnel*

(a) Men who will serve as assistants to the site director. There will be six in number.

(b) They will carry out the wishes of the site director in procurement of food, equipment, supplies, act as messengers and drive the site station wagon or van.

(c) They will most likely be young men and will participate in the site director training.

#### *8. Medical personnel*

Medical personnel will be contracted from the nearest towns of the Peninsula. They will be available if emergency aid is needed. The communication plan will provide for their availability as well as availability of back-up medical people.

### CAMP TRAINING AND EXPERIENCES

At all six campsites there will be general training of the boys concerning outdoor living, including: camp cooking, fire prevention, sanitation, first aid, woodsmanship, forestry, conservation, ecology, survival, wilderness construction, swimming, etc. This training will be carried out by counselors, site managers and occasionally outside people, such as forest service personnel, loggers, sanitarians, geologists, ecologists, and other experts in the field.

#### *Site specialties*

Each site will teach a specialty. For example, the boys will learn simple mountaineering under rigid supervision and expert control, glacier and crevasse dangers, rock formation, snow traveling, etc. At the ocean they will learn shore oceanography, tides and surf precautions. This training will be done in an informal manner, mostly through field experiences where the boys practice their skills as they go along.

#### *Work program*

The boys will be expected to spend part of every site session, perhaps part of every day, at a task that will enhance the beauty or suitability of each site area. For example, on the beach they may clean up debris or help rebuild coast shelters and toilets. They will be paid for this work. They will be entitled to draw their wages at the end of the summer only. Each boy who stays the whole 6 weeks will earn \$150. Work programs will be developed in conjunction with State Parks, Forest Service, National Parks, or whatever other public management agencies may be concerned. It is expected that valuable cooperation can be obtained from the staffs of these agencies.

#### *Merit and achievement recognition*

There will be an appropriate merit and achievement recognition program as the boys advance in proficiency and achievement and greater self-sufficiency.

### COMMUNICATIONS

During intensive on-site training and during main camp session the executive director and his staff will be located at a central location on the Peninsula.

Since most of the locations will be remote it will be necessary to have short-wave radio communication and message relay centers established in connection with each of the six sites. All sites are to be within easy communication of the headquarters. The headquarters will be reachable from Seattle on a twenty-four hour basis. The Seattle office of the program will be manned on a twenty-four hour basis to facilitate communications.



### *Back-up communications*

Sites in remote locations will also be reachable via Forest Service, Park Service, State Department of Natural Resources networks. A number of the sites will be reachable by vehicle. There will be standby arrangements made for use of Coast Guard planes and helicopters.

### *Scheduling in respect to communications*

The field headquarters will keep continuously informed on schedules and any changes in schedules through daily communication with site directors.

All related agencies (Forest Service, Park Service) field people will be briefed on camp programs before start of sessions as well as having many of them actively engaged in the program.

## SUPPLIES

### *1. Food*

Food will be procured in mass quantities. Non-perishables will be stocked at each site at various intervals throughout the summer, to be drawn on when needed. At least one four-wheel drive pick-up will be utilized. It will be the responsibility of the site manager to keep enough food on hand to feed all at the site and together with a week's reserve.

(a) Major procurement will be done in Seattle in advance of the beginning of the period of intensive training.

(b) Local procurement will occur under the direction of the executive director.

(c) A system of inventory and financial control will be established with the advice of qualified accountants.

(d) Financial accountability will be the responsibility of the executive director.

### *Menu*

(e) To the degree possible the menu will be ample, well balanced, nourishing and planned so that refrigeration will not be a problem.

(f) Sanitary and safe animal-proof food storage will be provided.

(g) Side trips will draw from site commissary.

### *2. Individual supplies*

(a) Each boy will be required to bring to camp with him *Clothing*:

#### Item:

Boots (\$9.60 cost) -----	1
Jeans -----	2
Khaki pants -----	1
Tennis shoes -----	1
Parka or jacket -----	1
Sweater -----	1
Hat -----	1
Bathing suit -----	1
Blanket -----	1
T-shirts -----	4
Shorts -----	3
Sox -----	6
Heavy sox -----	3
Towel & Washcloth -----	1
Sweatshirt -----	1
Heavy shirt -----	1

He will be allowed to bring these things only. The camp will provide sleeping bags and rain gear (ponchos). No surplus gear will be allowed due to the high degree of mobility needed in this program.

(b) In the event that a boy's family cannot meet these supply requirements the camp will supply necessary essentials. Such supplies will be raised from the Seattle community as needed.

### *3. Basic equipment each party (8 boys)*

(a) 9-man cooking kit (complete).

(b) First aid kit

(c) Axe, shovel, folding saw

(d) Rope (safety)

(e) Common shelter

(f) Water container

(g) Compass

(h) Maps

(i) Local guide books as required

- (j) Insect repellant
- (k) Large flashlight and flashlights for party members
- (l) Each party of eight will draw local equipment as needed from site commissary, e.g., wilderness construction tools, life jackets.

#### 4. *Site equipment*

- (a) Field kitchens (or equivalent) capable of feeding basic brigade plus staff and visitors.
- (b) Shelter—semi-permanent:
  - Tents, plastic.
  - Tent floors.
  - Latrines.
  - Washing facilities.
  - Portable sink, plastic pipe.
  - Mock-up hot water.
  - Locked food storage.
  - Locked tool storage.
- (c) Tools:
  - Cross cut saw, nails, hammers.
  - Axes.
  - Shovels, picks.
  - Battle lanterns.
  - Limited auto repair tools.
- (d) Communications equipment: Walkie-talkie.
- (e) Substantial first aid kit.
- (f) Equipment appropriate to site:
  - Life saving equipment in Island site, life jackets, etc.
  - Stretchers, lightweight.

#### 5. *Headquarters equipment*

- (a) Desk, filing cases, typewriters.
- (b) Miscellaneous office supplies.
- (c) Radio equipment.
- (d) Maps.
- (e) Telephone.
- (f) Food storage facility.

#### 6. *Motor Pool (see transportation plan, page)*

- (a) Repair service (contracted).
- (b) Seattle to and from sites—charter bus.
- (c) 3 buses, or more, capable of moving 54 (minimum) at one time. Perhaps using station wagons or vans as auxiliary.
- (d) Four-wheel-drive vehicle for site supply.
- (e) Stations wagons for trips to and from Seattle as needed, for local deliveries, messenger, auxiliary ambulance, miscellaneous transportation and communication. Each site should have one vehicle except Island site, which should have a small motor boat. Rentals should be explored as possibilities to fill this need.
- (f) Also, private vehicles can be used with adequate compensation.

### INSURANCE PLAN

- (1) Adequate insurance to cover the project activities during training session and regular session.
- (2) Insurance will include:
  - (a) High limit automobile liability and property damage.
  - (b) Special policies relating to school, camp type institution (including property damage done by campers).
  - (c) Fidelity bonds to cover persons who will handle cash or money.
  - (d) Operation of water craft, marine policies as needed for over water.
  - (e) Fire policies.
  - (f) Premises liability covering guests and visitors on property occupied by brigade or staff.
  - (g) Surplus or special lines of coverage suggested by broker.

### DISCIPLINE

Instances requiring discipline will naturally occur. Action in these cases will be confined to sitting down and discussing the problem with the boy's counselor. Perhaps the site director as a higher authority could be called. If the offense is



more serious the executive director should be notified and steps taken to resolve the difficulty. In all minor cases it will be the desire to allow the boy to continue in the program. Perhaps he would lose a portion of his pay or would be restricted from certain activities for a short while.

## FINANCES

[Summer program only, not annualized]

	Monthly rate	Annual rate	Estimated summer expense
<b>Administration:</b>			
Director.....	\$1,250	\$15,000	\$6,250
Assistant director.....	1,000	12,000	4,500
Secretary.....	600	7,200	3,000
Subtotal, administration.....		34,200	13,750
<b>Office expense:</b>			
Office space.....			(1)
Furniture.....			(1)
Equipment.....			\$500
Telephone:			
\$32 per month and \$25 estimates.....			2 185
Estimated \$100 long distance.....			100
Miscellaneous.....			200
Office supplies.....			200
Subtotal, office expenses.....			1,185
<b>Personnel:</b>			
6 site directors at \$750 per month, 2 months.....			9,000
42 counselors at \$400 per month, 2 months.....			42,000
Subtotal, personnel.....			51,000
FICA at 4.8 percent.....			2,448
Campers stipend: 288 times \$150.....			43,200
Physical checkups.....			(1)
<b>Food supplies:</b>			
288 times 42 equals \$12,086 times 2.....			24,192
48 times 56.....			4,704
Other.....			672
Subtotal, food supplies.....			29,568
Site equipment: 6 sites at \$1,500.....			9,000
<b>Packs:</b>			
300×\$4.....			1,200
Clothing: Boots.....			(3)
Ponchos, sleeping bags, U.S. Army.....			120
Miscellaneous clothes.....			(1)
Basic equipment \$75 per party.....			2,700
Work equipment.....			(4)
<b>Transportation:</b>			
Buses: 8 trips, \$2,400; 2 trips \$2,400.....			4,800
Vehicles: 12 cents per mile, 2,000 miles for 6 sites.....			1,440
Subtotal, transportation.....			6,240
Heavy duty van, \$250 per month for 3 months.....			750
Packer.....			1,000
Insurance: \$5.50 per 100 campers per day.....			1,000
Miscellaneous funds.....			3,500
Total.....			166,661

<sup>1</sup> Donated.<sup>2</sup> For 5 months.<sup>3</sup> Out of wages.<sup>4</sup> Borrowed.

The CHAIRMAN. Explain the "central area," so that the record may be clear.

Mr. DOLSTAD. The central area is the area in the city of Seattle that is predominantly black. It is the Garfield district.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the approximate population of this area?

Mr. DOLSTAD. I think around about 50,000 or 60,000. They just set up a central area council. One of the board members of this particular group I am working with now is one of the members on that council.

We wonder if this could not be a prototype for such a bill as you have suggested, Senator, because we know it works with the student conservation program. Most of those young people are able to volunteer, and we know—or at least I know—that we have many young people in the Nation who cannot volunteer their services during the summer months. They have to have some sort of monetary return. Your bill does this.

If this would work, if such a prototype would work, using the central area group, I am just sure that what you are suggesting here is an outstanding bill.

The CHAIRMAN. What sort of a mixture have you had in your summer program at Olympic National Park, as far as the background of the participants is concerned?

Mr. DOLSTAD. One of our goals, unlike what you suggest, is to have a geographical distribution, but also an economic, political, social distribution. We try to get students from all different backgrounds. For instance, during the recent campaign, one boy had on his pack a Nixon label, and another had on his hat a McCarthy button. This is what is really unique about this.

The CHAIRMAN. Where was the Humphrey button?

But economically you accept them from all categories, do you not?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Yes, all categories, and those who cannot pay the travel expenses, such as the two boys from Harlem last year, we give a travel allowance, because, obviously, without that help, some of them could not go. I think it is extremely important to have a mixture.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you find that where you have this mixture, as contrasted with all of them being disadvantaged, it offers an opportunity for development, that they wouldn't get otherwise?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Yes. If everyone would be disadvantaged, they wouldn't have any aspirations. But where you take a disadvantaged individual and put him in with the others that are very strongly goal oriented, they pick up. The others don't go down.

The CHAIRMAN. You can help the disadvantaged youth a lot more when there are those within the group who are not from that background, and who do not suffer the same trials and tribulations that the youngster who has been disadvantaged suffers. Is that your point?

Mr. DOLSTAD. That is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You help to strengthen the disadvantaged by mixing the group, and if they are all disadvantaged, it is harder, is it not, to really make progress in improving their opportunities and strengthening their own attitude for various matters?

Mrs. Titus?

Mrs. TITUS. Senator, I see advantages for the others as well, because there is much more of an understanding for those students who might never have been in the ghetto.

The CHAIRMAN. Those who come from a much more affluent background?

Mrs. TITUS. Yes, and they have not only a sympathy but an understanding. So both sides have a chance to learn from each other.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very good point.



Mr. DOLSTAD. Last summer the only black students that some of the boys had seen had been in the servant capacity. They had only seen a black individual as a servant. I think this is tragic. I think it is much better that they see him as an individual on a program with a pair of blue jeans and a T-shirt on doing the same kinds of work.

The CHAIRMAN. How many did you have at the Olympic National Park last year?

Mr. DOLSTAD. We had 30 young men.

The CHAIRMAN. How many in Mount Rainier?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Thirty.

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty in each place?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Pardon me, the Mount Rainier program was only a trial basis. We had 15 students at Mount Rainier.

Mrs. TITUS. We had one high-school-age group at Mount Rainier last year. There were four different park areas that had the high-school-age group of which there are approximately 15 boys in the group. Last year was the first year at Mount Rainier so that actually there were 18.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your budget annually?

Mrs. TITUS. Last year it was about \$70,000, which covered the administrative costs—covers the travel and financial costs—of getting the students out into the areas. So actually this comes also to the costs for the college students and the graduate students because these students are there all summer long working as park assistants again volunteering their services.

I hope it is taken into consideration that this age group also wishes to work and learn and they are from all walks of life. They, too, should be given an opportunity.

Mr. DOLSTAD. These young people can do all kinds of work. Up at the Smith ranch they did plumbing, foundation work, roofing, just about anything with a little direction.

The CHAIRMAN. I stayed at the Smith ranch last summer.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I am glad you were able to use the facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad to hear that you were able to make some improvements in the plumbing.

Mrs. TITUS. This morning, a gentleman was saying they were afraid of students using tools. Last summer I met one of our college students, a most attractive girl, and I said, "Of all the work that you have been doing this summer as a park assistant, what did you really enjoy most?", and she said, "Working the chain saw."

So even women can use chain saws and construction tools, and I am glad to see that they are included in your bill.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I am glad to say that we have not had an accident in the 12 years of our existence. Our original costs were \$250 per student in our groups, and we do use tents and we sleep out. The Olympics are sometimes not always dry, but it is part of the experience.

The CHAIRMAN. That is an understatement. Let me ask you about the foundation for a moment. How much of an endowment do you have in the foundation?

Mrs. TITUS. We have no endowment. Our funds are raised each year from other organizations and groups and this is the limiting factor of this whole program as far as we are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. So you really don't have a trust fund?

Mrs. TITUS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought maybe you had some silent donor.

Mrs. TITUS. We wish we did. This is our main problem. I am not a fundraiser. We need help in fundraising. Actually at this point our board of directors also are doing what they can do to help. We do have support from the Ford Foundation, which is the reason why we can offer travel and equipment scholarships to those students that couldn't otherwise come. We have support from the American Conservation Association, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller and other such people who have been very much interested in the organization and have been helping us. Without this support we would not be able to even offer these opportunities.

But we wish we could have a private supporter or some supporter that could help us.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the rest of the money you raise generally comes from around the country?

Mrs. TITUS. Generally around the country and through contributors and also Congress did authorize the National Park Service to help us. They were authorized to expend up to \$25,000 to help the program. Now, that is not money that they give to us.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand.

Mrs. TITUS. That is moneys that they are able to use to help keep our costs down. So that is of inestimable help.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Jordan.

Senator JORDAN. Mrs. Titus, these are two fine statements. How are your people selected? How are the youngsters selected to participate? You must have many more applicants than you have room for.

Mrs. TITUS. We certainly do, and that is so sad. This year we sent out 1,500 requests to people wanting to come into this program. Each student must complete an application consisting of a four-page personal request, a school application and transcripts of grades to find those students who can do the most with what they learn, so that they can then spread the information on to other people.

Generally speaking the selection committee that goes over all these applications works on the basis of leadership experience for students who have a desire to do something, a desire for service, a desire for helping. We do take those students also that are weaker, hoping that we can help those students who need the program in every way, shape, or form.

But it has been fascinating to see what these students have been accomplishing afterward from even just a 3-week experience under Jack's program. They will take this experience and desire and set up other conservation clubs and groups. One set up a conservation club at Harvard University in his freshman year. Now he is setting up a magazine on conservation to try to spread the word. He hadn't been doing this before, but he feels that students can and should take this on as a cause.

Senator JORDAN. How much do you pay them?

Mrs. TITUS. We don't pay them anything. They get their board and lodging and that is all. That is all they get for the entire time. Yet they are clamoring to get into this kind of work. I spoke to one of our students mentioning that we were coming down here. He said, "Please let the Senators know that we youth want this kind of training and the kind of experience that we can do something with."



That was one of the boys who had been in the program last year. There is a desire and an interest.

Senator JORDAN. You don't have any dropout problem?

Mrs. TITUS. No dropout problem.

Mr. DOLSTAD. We have never had a dropout.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a big backlog that you cannot accommodate each year?

Mrs. TITUS. It is just like saying that we are on the final decisions of who got his application completed first, which outstanding student. It is so sad.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I think the discouraging thing is that, when you look through 600 or 700 applicants and they are all acceptable and you can only pick 30 who want to contribute to their society, I think it is just tragic that we can't choose them all.

Mrs. TITUS. Somebody put an article in the Boston newspaper several years ago. From just that little brief paragraph in the Boston newspaper, we received over 500 applications from that area alone. At that time we had 50 students we could select from all over this country.

Senator JORDAN. In how many States do you operate?

Mrs. TITUS. Well, the Forest Service has asked us to expand on their lands and other agencies are asking us to expand in their areas if we can, but financially we are having trouble. So it is now in 20 different areas around the country. Our students are coming at this point, not including the students from this year, from more than 40 States, including Alaska, Hawaii, and all parts of this country. Also now nine foreign countries are represented and this year we are even having students from Finland who want to come into this program because they feel that the experience and knowledge they will gain from it will be so valuable when they go back again to Finland.

Senator JORDAN. I think this is tremendous.

The CHAIRMAN. It really is. I want to compliment both of you for what you have done, and for what you are doing I sincerely appreciate your thoughtfulness in coming to Washington to give us the benefit of your own experience. I think the experience, Senator Jordan, that they have had in this area is completely relevant to the bill before us.

I especially want to say that concerning your comments on the effects of having the mixed group, mixed in every sense—economically, socially, ethnically, politically—you have met all the requirements that can be accomplished, and I must say that the comments that you made in that regard are extremely helpful to me. I have always felt that it is going to be much harder to help a disadvantaged youth if everyone around him is disadvantaged. I think we have this idea that somehow we are going to take that one group and try to resolve all the problems. A lot of the problems we are having with youngsters do not necessarily come from the disadvantaged at all. Some of those who come from extremely prosperous and affluent backgrounds are causing a big part of the trouble in the colleges, in the high schools, and other areas.

So your testimony here and the advice that you have given us is extremely helpful. I want to compliment both of you.

Mrs. TITUS. Thank you.

Mr. DOLSTAD. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Your prepared statement will be included at this point, Mr. Dolstad.

STATEMENT OF JACK DOLSTAD, STUDENT CONSERVATION PROGRAM, OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

Mr. Chairman, my name is Jack Dolstad. I am presently employed as an Administrator for Seattle School District No. 1, and have been a teacher and counselor in the Seattle Schools since 1951. For the past twelve years my wife and I have operated the Student Conservation Program in Olympic National Park.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I commend you for your insight by combining two major problem areas in the natural resource field into one bill. That is, how to improve federal lands by using the untapped potential of restless American youth. As you so well know, the most significant improvement in federal lands occurred during the nine years of the CCC. In Olympic National Park no significant improvements to back country travel have been made since. Some of the CCC trails have not even been reopened, much less maintained.

Now that our parks are subjected to the most intensive use in history it seems most unwise to place budgetary limitations on the existing staffs unless serious thought is given to closing some of the more famous areas. The world situation forcing these limited appropriations may be the necessary spark for congress to again continue its efforts to establish a YCC which should provide manpower at less expense to the government.

The aims of the YCC (S 1076) and the program we have operated for the past twelve years are essentially the same:

1. To assist the National Park Service by having students do work that otherwise could not be done.
2. To benefit the students by offering them a program of conservation education through field experience,
3. "To recreate reverence for the land, its wildlife and its space."

The appeal to youth differs in lowering the participating age to 14 rather than 16, and making a salary available. Applications are mailed nationwide to all who request the forms, but publicity has been limited to protect too many disappointed young people who wish to volunteer.

The working period, although shorter, three weeks as compared up to 90 days, was scheduled during the busy summer when the park is under the strain of peak visitor use.

Even some of the projects suggested in S. 1076 have been accomplished by the SCP in National Park Lands.

Conservation Education is also an integral part of the SCP program. Since the proposed bill is so similar to the SCP, a brief review of the SCP would seem appropriate.

In starting the SCP the basic questions necessary for a program were determined to be:

1. Could adequate funding be secured?
2. Was a federal agency interested in having such a program, both in the top administration, and in the field?
3. Were competent supervisors interested and were they available?
4. Were young people really interested in volunteering their services or was this wishful thinking by the older generation?
5. Could these young people produce and was it safe to turn them loose with hazardous tools in remote roadless areas?
6. Would knowledgeable speakers support program by traveling long distances to talk with students?

The first four questions were answered positively before the start of the program in 1957. The last two questions were affirmed during the first program.

However, the 1957 program proved to have limited success in Olympic National Park. For too much time was spent by the park staff in administering the program. The superintendent stated "that using the ranger force to supervise the program work substantially interfered with their regular work program during the park's busy season." Fortunately, both the participants and sponsors considered the program a success.

To overcome the objections expressed by the Park Service a job and camp supervisor were hired for the 1958 season. Starting with the 1958 summer season the SCP has enjoyed complete endorsement and outstanding success by all who have been involved with the program: the Federal Agencies, the Student Conservation Association, Inc., the Supervisors, and the participants.

Superintendent Daniel B. Beard of Olympic National Park wrote:

We are all agreed that the work accomplished was worthwhile in every respect. Supervision was good, and the quality of work was as good as was done by regular



park crews. We recognize that the students were assigned to work that was relatively non-technical in nature. It would have cost the government approximately \$8,000 to have accomplished the same amount of work. This estimate is, if anything, rather low. The work at the Humes Ranch has stimulated a discussion on the preservation of pioneer homesteads in the park to such an extent that we have requested a research program to evaluate these homesteads with the thought in mind that the government should preserve the physical remains as well as the culture of these early pioneers somewhat as has been done at the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. It seems very doubtful if this would have been considered if the Humes Ranch restoration program had not been accomplished by the group.

The Park Staff was not inconvenienced in any way by the presence of the students this year. I think you will be interested in knowing that I did not tell anyone to do anything specific in relation to the group but left all members of the staff to use their own initiative in accordance with their interests. Those who assisted by talks or in any way did so without any direct or indirect orders from me. I do not know of any instance wherein a member of the Park staff neglected any other of his activities to give attention to your program.

As mentioned to you in conversations, we are indeed interested in having the program back next summer approximately on the same basis as this year. (1958)

For the record I will just quote one participant, Mark Collins, 1963, who was just killed in Viet Nam.

I think the program is very worthwhile and should be continued. It provides experience, enjoyment, and employment for deserving students. I hope that it could be expanded (perhaps with federal aid) to include more students and areas. It would also be worthwhile if someday it could include some less fortunate students who lack any kind of job opportunities because of circumstances, etc. I believe the ideal program would include several levels from a comprehensive educational level as a springboard for those interested in NPS as a career to a kind of CCC for unemployed teenagers.

Why is such a program a success?

1. The majority of the young people of this nation want to lead positive, constructive, lives. An opportunity to be useful is what they ask. There are presently too few opportunities for employment for this age group.

2. The participants were given recognition and the feeling of being wanted by the park staff.

3. A variety of work was planned with a shorter daily working period. Younger people have shorter attention spans, and are physically less able to work longer hours. The SCP has never had a serious accident or injury on the job.

4. Knowledgeable speakers were located and were willing to work with this age group.

5. Supervisors were available from the nation's teaching corps.

6. The groups were kept small—maximum of sixteen participants to two supervisors with a narrow age limit, 16–18. The 14–15 year old has much different interests than the more sophisticated 16 and 17 year old. One suggestion for your consideration would be to have groups designated to camps according to age and sex.

Even after twelve years the SCP still has one very severe problem area, funding, which limits the program to less than 150 positions. Over 1,500 applications have been sent to candidates this year. The costs of the program have been minimal in terms of accomplishments notwithstanding the values gained by our youth. In Olympic National Park the Park Service received over 5,000 hours of dedicated volunteer labor. My wife and I, not to mention the park service, are constantly amazed at the amount of work this age can accomplish. Even more astonishing the participants want to work hard.

The enactment of S. 1076 will provide a greater number of young people the opportunity to participate constructively for the improvement of the nation's land. Since the SCP has of necessity limited itself to volunteers a concerned group of Seattle outdoor enthusiasts and central area leaders drafted a proposal similar to S. 1076. A copy of this draft is submitted for your information. We know the SCP is successful. This group would like the opportunity to implement a trial project using a younger urban youth group and giving them a chance to live and work in a wilderness environment. If this type program also is successful S. 1076 should have strong support from the American public.

I came to this hearing today from Seattle at my own expense to strongly support S. 1076 even though the SCP student groups would probably be eliminated when

this bill becomes law. I do this for I feel that more young people deserve the opportunity to experience an SCP type program.

As the progress of civilization limits the experience of the basic conditions of nature in everyday life, it is increasingly important for students to know personally what wilderness has to teach. Our modern mechanisms give us mastery of our environment and a false sense of sufficiency regarding it. Without their gadgets and away from television sets, the youth come to realize man's dependence on the whole community of life. Paradoxically, they also become more independent as individuals, even to the extent of travel by foot. In wilderness, the pace of life is slower and people can become individuals to each other.

The boys were educated by their very participation in the program and with the aid of resource speakers. The lessons of wilderness include: the timelessness of life, the appreciation of life in past ages, the benefits of recreation to individuals, and the acquisition of knowledge by direct observation. In particular, the boys learned about the specific park in which the program was located. They learned the physical skills of using tools and the personality skill of working effectively. They learned basic conservation principles and attitudes by which to form judgments of value for the rest of their lives.

We want to see a greater number of young people deposit their time and energy in the bank of the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

(Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at 2 p.m., the same day.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Our first witness this afternoon is Dr. Spencer Smith, of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

It is always a pleasure to welcome you back to the committee, Dr. Smith. We are delighted to receive the benefit of your views on this matter.

#### STATEMENT OF DR. SPENCER SMITH, CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Dr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Spencer M. Smith, Jr., secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

I will be brief, but I want to call two matters to the attention of the committee.

It is analogous, I suppose, to what then President-elect Roosevelt said in 1932 to a group of economists in Albany, N.Y. He said that he appreciated the economists' ability to make things terribly complex, but there were a lot of things in the country that needed done, and a lot of people willing to do them. He could not quite understand why they could not be brought together without the complexities offered by the economists.

We have known for a number of years, and we certainly knew it at the time many of us attempted to achieve the introduction of the Youth Conservation Corps in the mid-1950's, by Congressman Blatnik and then Senator Humphrey. Later on, this became title I of the Youth Employment Act, and still later, a part of the Job Corps of the antipoverty program.

The bill which the committee is considering has been appraised carefully by citizens committee and we have studied your remarks, Senator, in the introduction of the bill. We certainly strongly support the enactment of this legislation.



If we have a criticism, it is that the bill may be too much of a prototype. After the testimony I heard in the chamber this morning, however, I understand why you submitted the measure in this form.

The difficulty that has occurred in most instances is concerned about costs. Unfortunately, the one thing that nobody ever mentions in the conservation centers is the benefits derived.

Neighborhood Youth Corps and similar youth projects at the State levels, which are primarily urban and do train people, do not cause an appreciation of some \$66 million in the investment of natural resources as do the conservation centers.

A critical matter which was discussed this morning in the hearing and we wish to emphasize, is the 90-day learning period. Apparently people have not paid any attention to the experience we had either with the old CCC in the 1930's or the experience we have been having in the conservation centers of the Job Corps.

I made 40 trips to a variety of conservation centers in the Job Corps, and I can testify to the fact that 90 days is a rather extensive period in terms of what can be accomplished and what has been accomplished.

We have seen wildlife habitat improvement projects which require some fairly sophisticated judgments by kids who possess nowhere near 90-days' experience or training.

So I think the idea that a 90 day learning period is so inadequate that we are going to waste money is a bunch of nonsense. I don't think experience so dictates.

Another often repeated concept is the need for neighborhood camps in order to keep the kids close to home. I thought the idea was to help these enrollees—help them in terms of intermingling with others who may not be disadvantaged and one of the principal aids was to take them out of the neighborhood.

If you are in Harlem what good is a particular Job Corps installation in Harlem? It may be that the best thing you can do for that child is to take him out of that environment and put him in another.

It occurs to me that this can be done, when the critics suggest it, without moving the enrollees from one coast to the other. You can still transfer them from a specific kind of environment to another without undue cost. We have plenty of opportunities on forest lands in the East. There are many other opportunities in addition to the national forests.

It is very difficult for us to understand how cost can be a factor at this point. As you know, the cutback in the Job Corps that the administration made was almost exclusively in the conservation centers, and the cost per individual in the conservation centers was less than in the Women's Corps Centers and it was also less than in the Men's Corps Centers in the urban areas. Yet this is not where they cut.

The cut was made in the Conservation Job Corps Centers.

The estimates also which have been made by the Department of Labor—and since I read the Department of Labor's analysis in the closing of the Job Corps, I am reluctant to take any of their estimates—say it is approximately \$1,000 per enrollee.

We have installations in our Conservation Job Corps Centers valued at \$96 million, which we are going to abandon. I don't know what use will be made of them.

We reportedly were criticized because we did not get the facilities up to date quick enough. Now we have investments in facilities in the

Conservation Job Corps of \$96 million. It averages approximately \$1,100,000 per center and the critics indicate this is excessive.

The Secretary of Labor said we are going to turn them back to their previous owners. Most of these installations have been constructed since the Job Corps, Senator, so the previous owner is the Federal Government.

Certainly these installations, I assume, would be useful to the purposes of S. 1076.

I hope that even the prototype that you suggest will be achieved. I don't know, and I never have understood completely, why there has been the opposition to the Youth Conservation Corps concept that there has been in this country.

We have been involved in a lot of controversial natural resource policy matters, but I do not recall of an instance where there have been more occasions when my origin has been questioned and my destiny prescribed as it has been in the instance of defending the youth conservation program.

Certainly the services that we can expect from these young people are important. I was in the former Secretary of Agriculture's office some time ago, Mr. Freeman, when we were trying to find out when this program really began to be productive, and we thought at first, it was the availability of facilities, since the program started very quickly with inadequate facilities.

It turned out, however, that this really was not the turning point. Rather, it was when the message got across to the kids that they were not there just for rehabilitation, but their efforts were really needed.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not just a make work proposition?

Dr. SMITH. It never was.

There is some difficulty in analyzing this. I see the GAO's analysis, which is a good accountant's analysis.

I made the comment this morning that this is very much like reading Thomas Macaulay's "History of the French Revolution." It is an excellent and probably the most definitive book of this period ever written. Unfortunately, you can read it and not have the slightest idea about the French Revolution. You would probably have to read Dickens' "Tale of Two Cities." Though a novel, it does impart the spirit of the French Revolution.

By and large I can assure you that the people who prepared the GAO report never were in the Job Corps conservation centers.

I don't say that every bit of legislation that a person acts upon requires his presence on the scene but in this instance it would have been helpful. The Job Corps cadets were doing useful work. They were making contributions.

I think the real acid test would be to see a group of these enrollees as they first come to the conservation centers. One would see kids who had never been to school, were functional illiterates, and 85 percent of whom needed extensive dental and medical treatment before they could even take part in any of the activities of the Corps.

I thought I knew what constituted deprived children. I did not, until I visited some of these Job Corps and saw some of these enrollees.

If you see them come in, and go back 3 months later and see these individuals functioning at that time, then one has a basis of judgment.

That has not been done in the present evaluation. The projects listed here, though important, are apparently not understood by



many. They are mentioned in the chairman's comments on the Senate floor, in the bill, and in the release.

These results are accomplished facts and they are not leaf-ranking operations, as the Secretary of Labor implied the other day when he said that this was primarily a manpower problem.

Of course it is a manpower problem, and it always has been. We have never doubted this but neither are we suggesting that the Job Corps constituted a slave labor camp. We are contending, however, that these people functionally performed, and they performed admirably.

I think the best evidence is to talk to some of them. They are more than willing to discuss their experiences. Somebody can say, "Well, they dug some ditches." I think it is one thing to say that you used a shovel to dig ditches, but if this is a part of a reforestation operation, or a fire control problem, then such activity in this framework is entirely different than just assuming that manual labor only is being performed.

I think it has been an excellent program. I hope this one is initiated for I am sure it will be effective if it is adopted. We certainly support it, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. As always, I appreciate the advice and counsel you have given us.

I must say I would like to have suggested a bigger program for this year, but I am trying to be a realist in light of the climate we are working in. I think the best that we can anticipate is some kind of a pilot program for the summer. That is why I am anxious to move right along on this legislation. I would like to get this bill through the Senate and get the House to act early, so that we can get this pilot program going this summer.

Dr. SMITH. I would like to see it happen.

I want to reemphasize also your colloquy this morning with one of the witnesses, that just to bring in the disadvantaged children and youth into this program is not an effective tool, in our judgment. If you have just disadvantaged people——

The CHAIRMAN. You are satisfied with our language?

Dr. SMITH. Absolutely. I think it is excellent language. I hope that the program does go forward, and the language is retained.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the agencies, the two great Departments, Interior and Agriculture, ought to have that discretion. If you are going to have a pilot program, you ought to have room for some trial and error.

I am more and more convinced that the disadvantaged ought to be mixed with the advantaged. It will help them, and it will help the advantaged, as well.

Dr. SMITH. I think we have a basis of experience for that. I think you are absolutely right.

The CHAIRMAN. I think if you put only disadvantaged youngsters in the program that this is a greater burden on everyone than where you have a situation where they are mixed. Otherwise, you just move the ghetto right right into the national forests and national parks. The idea is to try to bring about some kind of integration, socially, economically, ethnically culturally, and every other way.

Thank you again, Dr. Smith. We appreciate your help and your comments.

Dr. SMITH. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness will be Dr. Louis Twardzik, chairman, Department of Parks and Recreation Administration, Michigan State University. Doctor, we are delighted to have you come this great distance to be with us this afternoon.

If you have a prepared statement, you can put it all in the record and just orally hit the high points if you desire.

**STATEMENT OF DR. LOUIS TWARDZIK, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION ADMINISTRATION, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY**

Dr. TWARDZIK. I will, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Louis Twardzik, chairman, Department of Parks and Recreation Administration, Michigan State University.

I do have a prepared statement, which I will submit for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will appear in the record at the end of your oral presentation.

Dr. TWARDZIK. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the purposes of the bill.

This might sound strange from a person who has a primary interest in the recreation use of resources, except that I am of the conviction that the best recreation use of resources will be made by public knowledge about the environment. I therefore hope that the intent of this bill will reflect an emphasis on educating youth in ecology and conservation, with the conservation project serving as a reinforcing of the learning experience.

I also hope, Mr. Chairman, that the ultimate development of camps, as described in this bill, will not be limited to Federal areas. I envision, as this program eventually gains public acceptance, that the program will require camps that would be appropriately developed on State areas as well as Federal areas. If this ultimate of development is achieved in this program, it is conceivable that it will be necessary to have private camps utilized.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you define the State areas? What kind of priority would you give on State property?

Dr. TWARDZIK. At this time, I would consider these State properties being similar to the Federal properties, State park areas, State game and fish areas, State hunting areas.

The CHAIRMAN. State forests?

Dr. TWARDZIK. That is right.

I am convinced that if this program is to achieve what I sense to be the intent of the bill, it cannot and should probably not be attempted to take place in one summer. I would like to think that this could be a graduated program, where students could attend first year camps as beginners, attending the beginners' camp for the study of ecology and conservation, and in the second summer attend a camp that might be referred to as a regular camp, and in the third summer an upper-classman type of camp. Regardless of the terms, I think a graduated program would serve well for this kind of Federal project.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate you on not limiting participating youth to the economically deprived. I think most would agree that generally the youth of the country are deprived in their knowledge of ecology and conservation.



I am suggesting in my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, that the camps should be staffed with university professors to teach ecology and conservation. I am suggesting that there are a number of benefits that might come about from this kind of staff. University professors of ecology and conservation would be responsible for developing the curriculums in relation to the work projects.

One of the most obvious, I think, would be that the university teacher would bring a more substantive kind of knowledge about ecology and conservation to the students. I think the university professor, being a teacher in a camp, might very well help attract graduate students from the various universities to also participate in this program, and to also serve as teachers, teaching aides, and supervisors of projects. I think it might assist in the continuity of the program, especially if the program is graduated over a three-summer period. I know that it would be of great assistance to many graduate students in providing them with an opportunity to find and to pursue thesis topics. I think this is an extra benefit that we should not forget.

I would also like to think that those who you have already identified as potential high school dropouts might be stimulated by being exposed to teachings of university people, that they might very well be stimulated when they return home to continue their education.

The National Recreation and Park Association completed a recreation manpower study recently, and they noted that the gap is tremendous between the supply of young professionals who are trained in the park and recreation field and the demand. I would hope, as a program of this type would move forward, that we might be able to attract some of these students who have graduated from the youth conservation program to the professional and public service of parks and recreation, starting with a university education in this field.

I also feel that professors, those who could be attracted to this kind of program, would benefit by their work in teaching ecology and conservation in a natural setting, as well as teaching a nonprofessionally committed student, which most of them are constantly working with. I would hope that the exposure to high school students, plus the kind of teaching environment, might help the teachers themselves.

It would seem to me also that with this kind of program, high school students might return to their high schools and receive credit for independent study from their high school teachers, which could become part of their academic record, and possibly that university mission counselors might look favorably upon such a record as they consider the college applications of these young people.

Mr. Chairman, the Youth Conservation Corps may well serve as a vehicle to finally bring about a public confrontation of the very serious and heretofore unresolvable problem of building an ecological basis for leisure society. If we are ever to have a people who will question developments and projects that neglect their environment, inquire about the alternatives, and insist on knowing the consequences, possibly a Youth Conservation Corps is the starting point. I hope you can initiate at least a pilot program as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. I assume that there will be no real trouble in getting the cooperation of the universities in connection with the

suggestion you made about professorial participation in those disciplines that are relevant to this?

Dr. TWARDZIK. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, you will have complete cooperation. However, there is the matter of the availability of professors, which, of course, I cannot speak for.

The CHAIRMAN. You have both a qualitative and a quantitative problem. It will take quite a number, and yet you want to get the best people in the biological sciences into the discussion.

Dr. TWARDZIK. Mr. Chairman, in my prepared testimony, I make note of the thought that if this program were to move, as I am sure is the intention of this committee, I feel rather strongly that the finest talent of scientists and researchers and teachers at the universities in the natural sciences will be attracted to this program.

I have a feeling that they will recognize the unique opportunity they might have to work with young people in this kind of an environment. I cannot think of anybody who would recognize the significance of this any more than university teachers.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure of that. I think the problem is the numbers of professors who would be available, but this is something we can get some good information on out of a pilot approach.

Thank you. Your testimony has been very helpful. I liked your emphasis on the educational aspects.

Thank you very much.

Dr. TWARDZIK. Thank you.

(The prepared statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF LOUIS F. TWARDZIK, PROFESSOR AND CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF PARK AND RECREATION RESOURCES, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, my name is Louis F. Twardzik, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Park and Recreation Resources at Michigan State University.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the invitation to share with you my views on Senate Bill 1076, the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1969.

I have a prepared statement which I will submit for the record.

Before I proceed with my remarks about those provisions of Senate Bill 1076 that relate most directly to my role as an administrator of a university curriculum in park and recreation resources, I would like to offer some general comments about the Bill.

The intent of this Bill to provide summer employment opportunities for the Nation's youth in Federal conservation programs is admirable, but, in my opinion, not wholly adequate in scale and concept as currently proposed. It is generally conceded that the extensive efforts of the past administration to provide summer youth employment in the public sector and in business and in industry, coupled with the all-out efforts of many municipalities, still leaves a substantial number of our young people without summer employment. This sociological phenomenon of youngsters being without summer chores is, of course, understood as a product of our age. I maintain that since our generation helped create this situation of excessive leisure, we have an obligation to both the individual and society to provide adequate opportunities for our youth to make proper use of that leisure. This rationale, plus the reported backlog of conservation work projects on Federal areas, would satisfy the intent of the Bill, as it is now constructed.

There are other considerations, however, that lend themselves to the spirit of this Bill. The ultimate survival of society as we know it, or want it, may rest in large part in a people who understand themselves and their place in their environment.

One does not easily arrive at objective conclusions about critical environmental issues from a reference point bounded by city streets and text books. There should be a general agreement that these concepts about man and his natural environment are best taught in that same environment, and that the educational process of combining formal learning experiences with related physical activity



often reinforces the learning experience. This argues in favor of youth working on conservation type projects while being exposed to the elementary and basic ecological concepts involved in the projects. It is not enough to make this heavy investment in young people in order to merely clear a lot of brush and engage in erosion control projects on Federal areas. Instead, the Corpsmen should know why it is necessary to clear brush, the alternatives to clearing brush, and then the consequences of such decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate you on the language of the Bill, in that it does not limit the qualified youth to the economically underprivileged. In the sense of this Bill, most of this Nation's youth is underprivileged.

I am asking for consideration of a Youth Conservation Corps bill that would provide, along with the present provisions, opportunities for youth to be exposed to an understanding of the environment in which they will live. I also ask your consideration of a graduated program which would enable a student to enter as a Beginner during the first summer, a Regular during a second summer, and an Upper classman of the Corps during a third and final summer. May I also suggest that each camp be designated as one of these, or similar, classifications thereby enabling the Corpsmen to attend three different camps. I am assuming that there are various camps scattered throughout the country on state and Federal lands, which would serve this program during its early years. As the program gains public approval, I would expect that camps designed and constructed to the particular needs of the Youth Conservation Corps would be established.

To assure the quality of instruction in the study of natural and social ecology and a proper relationship between subject matter and study projects, I suggest that the camps be operated by governmental agencies under a contractual agreement with certain universities. While it is true that some secondary schools provide outdoor education programs, they are not generally geared to providing the teachers of ecology. I am suggesting that, if the universities with faculty in the natural and social sciences were to be responsible for the structuring of a camp's educational sessions and related work projects, the sponsoring governmental agency could provide the remainder of administration required to operate the camps. It would be expected that university faculty would draw heavily on qualified graduate students and secondary school teachers to assist in teaching and in project supervision. Faculty of the type and caliber envisioned would then be free to develop study and project curricula based on the resources of the area, and the capabilities and needs of the Corpsmen, within the general objectives of the Youth Conservation Corps program.

I do not feel that the intent of this Bill can be fulfilled by being limited to camps located on Federal lands and administered by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, except to serve as pilot programs. I would hope that the states would be offered a larger share of the responsibility for these programs, including the use of state land and Federal grants. In addition, there are hundreds of private camps located in every part of this country that might, with Federal financial aid, become part of the Youth Conservation Corps program.

The quality and scale of program being considered for the Youth Conservation Corps would be most difficult to achieve under the best of circumstances, and almost impossible without full-time administrative responsibilities being assigned to one Federal agency. The coordination and logistics that are required to make this kind of program operational should not be assigned as a part-time responsibility to existing Federal personnel.

I do not believe that we gain maximum return on investments on any endeavor, public or private, without providing for adequate evaluation procedures in advance of projects. I would strongly suggest that provisions for evaluative research be made an integral part of the Youth Conservation Corps from its inception. It occurs to me that many of us who have a concern for natural resource use would have greatly benefited from a more systematic evaluation of the Civilian Conservation Corps programs of the 1930's and 1940's. Hopefully, the more current Job Corps programs will have such information available about their work. We should be able to benefit from the successes and problems of others in structuring the Youth Conservation Corps.

According to a recent national manpower study by the National Recreation and Park Association for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the shortage of adequately educated professionals in Park and Recreation Resources who can, and will, address themselves to the problems of recreation resources and society is critical now, and the future prospect is worse. It is my

belief that a Youth Conservation Corps would provide a dramatic breakthrough in alerting high school students to (1) the existence of such professional careers, and (2) the social significance and personal rewards of this kind of public service.

I would also like to think that many potential high school dropouts, when exposed to university teachers and graduate students, might be encouraged to continue their education.

With the employment of university faculty to structure and teach in the Youth Conservation Corps programs, I am confident that many high schools will offer independent study credit for a Corpsman who graduates from the 3-summer program, and once the quality of the program is established, college admissions counselors might look favorably upon those experiences in evaluating a student's application.

It is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that the opportunity to be of service to high school youth in this important program would not be lost on university teachers and graduate students. I think that they would rally to this unique opportunity to expand young minds and bodies. I believe that the brightest and most prestigious scientists and teachers in universities throughout the Nation would participate in this program.

We are talking about large expenditures of public funds, and I think this should be recognized early. I hope you will pardon me if I do not apologize for recommending these expenditures because the essence of the Youth Conservation Corps program is rather important. We should, therefore, recognize now that this program will eventually require the establishment of expensive camps and expensive operational and logistical support, and not consider it as a quickly conceived public program merely to get young adults off the streets. You may even have to create a separate bureaucracy to administer the planning and development and operations of the Youth Conservation Corps.

Mr. Chairman, I do not visualize the Youth Conservation Corps program as being merely a ninety-day outing in exotic and scenic Federal parks and forests. The significance of the intent of this Bill goes to the heart of many of this Nation's problems with youth and with the present programs and policies involving man and his environment. It is because of this that I am, therefore, recommending a much larger program, one which includes the involvement of university faculty and graduate students, the states, private camps, a special Federal administrative unit, and a graduated program of education and training for each youth over a period of three summers.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness is Mr. Michael Frome, conservation editor, Field & Stream magazine.

Mr. Frome, you wrote a fine letter of support to me, which I appreciate very much. If you have a prepared statement, maybe you can put it into the record, and just cover some of the highpoints in your oral presentation.

#### STATEMENT OF MICHAEL FROME, CONSERVATION EDITOR, FIELD & STREAM MAGAZINE

Mr. FROME. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wholeheartedly favor the legislation, and urge its enactment for three reasons: First, it has great merit in its own right. Second, it can serve to overcome to a certain degree the tragic blunder committed by the administration in the announced closing of Job Corps camps. Third, the Youth Conservation Corps, operating in national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management can be the basis of an even broader program—an Environmental Corps—reaching into backyards and schoolyards, alleys and side streets, waterfronts and river banks of thousands of communities across the Nation.

The young people of the United States are ready and eager to go. I personally receive scores of letters from parents in behalf of their children, and from youngsters themselves, asking about summer job



opportunities in the outdoors as part of their life's education. I am sure you receive more than I do.

The success of the student conservation association and outward bound programs demonstrates the desire of the young to get going.

Action for the good is what young people crave, if this Nation is to proceed on a healthy course.

They already are doing things on their own. For instance, the other day I received a note from one of the editors at Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, the parent company of Field & Stream, regarding an outstanding "Conservation Awareness Project" being undertaken by the Thomas School, a private girls' prep school in Connecticut.

Apparently a group of the girls have been dragging themselves out of bed in the small hours of the morning to pass out literature at the Westport railroad station to commuters heading for New York. The document I received is headed "Statement of Concern."

It spells out the imminent destruction of our essential environment through air pollution, water pollution, overpopulation, and careless mismanagement of our natural resources. Then it continues, as follows:

Students are alarmed that man seems intent on rushing toward biological disaster.

They want to alert people to the biological situation, so that people may act to avoid it.

They want adults to accept responsibility for the future now.

They want to urge all concerned citizens to contact their political representatives and ask them to devote more of our National Resources to solving these biological problems now.

They want students and adults to work together to fight for the future now.

Establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps affords the adult generation a chance to keep faith with the young, to show with deed that our legacy is not only one of war and hate and environmental degradation, but of hope and confidence and peace.

It was the late Aldo Leopold, distinguished as both a conservationist and an educator, who once declared, "I am glad I shall never be young without wild country to be young in."

Preserves such as the national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and national resource lands of the BLM maintain the opportunity for successive generations to acquire the characteristics of pioneers, to acquaint themselves firsthand with conditions that have shaped our culture.

Such contacts are essential to the sense of being an American, and furthermore, to appreciating the mechanism of the land. The further we move from the natural ways of our ancestors, the further we move into urbanized insulation, the more so do people lose touch with their origins.

A society that relies on sewers to carry away its offal, living in cities recklessly spewing waste into streams, can hardly understand its dependence on natural resources, or exercise much effort to protect them.

Thus, I view the proposed Youth Conservation Corps not simply as a means of coping with frustration and boredom among the young, but as a basic investment in the country's future—one of the "growth stocks" of America, to use President Nixon's own expression.

Personally, I believe the first priority in the Youth Corps should be placed on the underprivileged. I agree with Jefferson's concept of

educating all those who have the capacity to learn, regardless of their social and economic status.

The middle and upper classes are much better equipped to take care of their own. They have the means to get their children off the street, while the impoverished are trapped in an endless cycle of futility, even in our land of boundless opportunity.

I was listening to your discussion on this question of integration of disadvantaged and advantaged. I have a little personal experience in this regard.

A few months ago, a major national magazine, not *Field & Stream*, asked me to do a survey and an article on camps for the gifted, cultured young people.

The primary basis of this is the activity of my own two children, who fall in the 14- to 18-year-old group, and who attend the National Music Camp in a lovely wooded setting in northern Michigan. It costs me a lot of money to send them there.

While it is perfectly true that the camp is quite proud of the fact that it awards scholarships, the fact is that scholarships are awarded to those who qualify, and music lessons cost a great deal, too.

So while I am all in favor of mixing the advantaged and disadvantaged, I feel that the kids who live in the dark ghettos are the ones who need the help and opportunity in this field the most.

In this regard, having visited Job Corps Conservation Camps, I cannot speak too highly of the fine work they have performed, or the fine work the agency performed.

The boys were given basic lessons in personal hygiene, sanitation, and human behavior, which they had never received before. They learned to read and write, to be prompt and neat, and how to work as members of a team.

They rendered outstanding service to the Nation in diverse kinds of conservation projects and, in so doing, many learned for the first time the pride in doing a job well, the satisfaction of belonging, and being needed.

The recent March issue of *Field & Stream* carried a major feature outlining a conservation program for the Nixon years, in which we urged expansion of programs of this nature as part of the active mission of the resource agencies.

They provide important work on the ground, contribute to the economy of local communities, and help to build useful citizens.

For the boys I saw in action, the Job Corps was a rendezvous with the land and with their own destiny. This concept must not be lost.

Looking ahead, the field should be considered wide open for innovation, participation of all levels of government, involvement of professions, and private philanthropy around the basic Youth Conservation Corps.

For instance, I recently received a letter from Mr. Fred Eldean, chairman of the Page Land & Cattle Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., who wrote as follows:

There is a very small project that I have been carrying on. However, it could be expanded nationally into substantial proportions. For the past few years I have paid the expenses for a few Negro boys to go to a two-weeks camp in the summer in Prescott National Forest. I have likewise paid for a few Negro girls to go to a similar camp. Negro youths attend each successive camp with their white counter-



parts. It happens that these two camps are conducted by the YMCA and YWCA, but there are other institutions that also run camps and a similar thing could be done for them. Many individuals could contribute to such an activity.

To view the picture from a different angle, there is no need to recite the disaster story of our present environmental crisis. New environmental disciplines are needed to reshape our world.

Brains are emphasized more often than brawn, but both are required of the environmentalist of tomorrow. Specialists will come from many backgrounds, from biology to business, public administration to art, law, education, writing, building, all sharing a common understanding of the need for balance between manmade and natural environments.

I would like to see, along with university professors, those people who write for a living and paint for a living involved with young people, particularly with the poor. I feel that the project in the Watts district of Los Angeles has done some wonderful things.

I think these kids out on the ground can have the opportunity not necessarily to repair fences or learn ecological lessons, but to learn how to paint and to learn how to interpret nature for the future.

The America the Beautiful Fund has had promising experience with one group of student environmentalists, including planners, landscape and architectural designers. By advocating new designs while still in training, they have been catalytic agents for hundreds of community projects.

Think of what might be accomplished in thousands of communities across the Nation, with students working during the summer, weekends, or afternoons and evenings, applying their imaginative talent and creative action through an Environmental Youth Corps, collaborating with forwarding-looking adults who genuinely respect their ideas and motivations and allow their frailties.

I certainly want to allow the frailties of the young people, considering all the frailties that we demand they allow of us.

At the National Youth Conference on Natural Beauty and Conservation in 1966, the president of the Conservation Foundation, Russell Train, now Under Secretary of the Interior, proposed a national young program of environmental inventory.

It is a wonderful idea that I wish I could claim as my own. It is designed to encourage the young to open their eyes and to see what is around them, to evaluate the good and the bad, to record observations on paper and on film, to ask questions, lots of them.

I have written books for teenagers and know they demand honest answers to their multitude of questions. They will not accept anything less. They are tired of platitude and sham.

Perhaps the most important issue in the legislation before the committee is whether young America is to be dealt with fairly and forthrightly.

The chairman, Senator Henry Jackson, by his sponsorship of the Youth Conservation Corps legislation, has shown his desire to keep faith with America's future. His proposal deserves support from all quarters, and early enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Frome, for an excellent statement, and also for the help that you are giving us through being editor for *Field & Stream*. Your writings have a tremendous impact on the public.

In connection with a limited program this summer, that is, a trial program, it seems to me that we can learn a lot about approaches that might be useful later on in a larger program. Maybe we ought to take one camp, which would be made up of all underprivileged, another one that is mixed, and a third with a greater mixture, and get some information. I am really interested in this aspect of it.

Rebellious youth today, as we have said earlier in the day and have repeated many times, are not necessarily all from the underprivileged classes. It is the affluent youngsters that are causing the most serious problems in many areas. So many parents today, because of prosperity and affluence, want to subcontract to others the job of being papa and mama. When you have a lot of money, you think you can do it.

Mr. FROME. Well, maybe in due course we will figure out a way of parent involvement in education, too. I do want to say I think it would be an excellent idea, if it could be clearly established, that at the inception what we are trying to do is to learn and to experiment, to have a trial period of different forms.

Of course, on these social welfare programs, the critics always demand a demonstration of economic return. I don't think we are dealing with a commodity where economic return is desirable. I think we are trying to develop people.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the good things in this area are not necessarily measurable on a cost-effective basis. I think one can make a strong case that way, but it seems to me that it is important that the youngsters realize that they, themselves, are making a contribution.

This is not just a make-work program. I am going on the premise that there is a need for many kinds of operation and maintenance work projects on our great natural resource projects that are valid and at the same time helpful in doing something for the youngsters.

I think they will feel they are not in the right place, at all, and they will catch on fast, if this is just a make-work program. It has to be more than that.

Mr. FROME. They are very smart. Today is the beginning of National Library Week, and I was invited to speak just this very morning to the whole school at Washington Mill Elementary School in my neighborhood. I had children from the first grade to the sixth grade, 550 of them. They cannot be fooled, either, even at their young age.

I think the country can learn a great deal from affording those youngsters in the Youth Conservation Corps camp a chance to determine their own future. I dare say that the affluent and the advantaged among the number may even find that they have much to learn from the so-called disadvantaged.

The CHAIRMAN. Both ways.

Mr. FROME. Both ways. I think the mix is good. The trial of different methodologies has much to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We appreciate your help.

Mr. FROME. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness will be Mr. Joseph Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America. We are always glad to have you come before us, and we welcome your comments.



**STATEMENT OF JOSEPH PENFOLD, CONSERVATION DIRECTOR,  
IZAACK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA**

Mr. PENFOLD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am J. W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America.

The league is a national, citizen organization, now in its 48th year, dedicated to the conservation of natural resources and the preservation of environmental quality to serve the needs and aspirations of a burgeoning public.

The league has supported the concept of a continuing Youth Conservation Corps program for many years. Quite a few of us in the league can look back to the depression years of the 1930's and recall personally the great values produced for the public through the CCC camps and the work and training camps of the National Youth Administration.

We can recall from personal experience the value of these programs to the young men who participated—in providing motivation, self-confidence, determination, and work skills. They went on to become integrated in the economic and social structure of the country, many of them rising to positions of critical responsibility in major fields of endeavor. Some walk the Halls of Congress today.

During the years of World War II, and to an extent during the Korean conflict, maintenance and development work within the national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges were necessarily cut back and slowed to a virtual halt. By the early 1950's, it became clear that these public areas could never meet the public need for outdoor recreation of high quality without programs of substantial manpower and funds.

The league and others urged creation of a Youth Conservation Corps patterned more or less after the earlier CCC and NYA programs. Legislation was introduced and reintroduced in successive sessions of Congress, but was never authorized.

Fortunately, Congress, however, became more liberal with appropriations to the Park Service Mission 66 and the Forest Service Operation Outdoors. In the late 1950's, the ORRRC was established and its report and recommendations published in 1962 gave fresh emphasis to both short- and long-range development plans and actions not only through Federal agencies, but through State and local resources as well.

But, in spite of the resource development progress made the past decade or more, we have largely failed to capitalize on the opportunities which conservation work affords to train and upgrade the potentials of young people, whom we might well call our ultimate resource.

We have largely failed to recall the lessons of the depression years by involving young people in our conservation efforts.

As the chairman of the full committee has described:

These young people would return to their homes and schools with a sense of accomplishment for having bettered our environment, and a sense of involvement in this Nation's efforts to provide a quality life and quality surroundings for all Americans. They would acquire an appreciation for our natural resources—they would develop good work habits and attitudes which would persist—this experience might provide the incentive to look and work toward a rewarding career in natural resources.

The legislation before you has a unique feature in that it provides primarily for summer employment of young people—the 3-month period when large numbers of them, for want of employment, are left on their own to wander the streets without much chance for any constructive activity.

S. 1076 also provides a focus on young people 14 to 18 years old.

Both provisions we like.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall digress briefly to describe a program which the Izaak Walton League is now engaged in cooperatively with the Interior and Agriculture Departments. It is germane.

Begun in the summer of 1963, the project is currently in its 7th year. Each year the league's State divisions contact the high schools of their States, seeking young men who are members of the senior class graduating the next June, who plan to enter college to study in a natural resource field, and who are scholastically and socially of high caliber.

Each State division has a selection committee—usually comprised of an IWLA officer, an educator, and a natural resources administrator. The selection committee reviews the applications and submits the three or four best to a national selection committee. The latter committee reviews all of these applications and selects the best to fill summer jobs that are made available by the agencies in Interior and the Forest Service and Agriculture.

In 1963, 13 were so selected. In successive years, as the program proved itself, the number has increased. This year, 54 will be placed.

About 200 young men from 26 States have had this opportunity, and the results are gratifying. "Graduates" of these summer jobs in the parks, forests, refuges, and public domain lands are now career employees in resource agencies, some are in graduate school by now, others are studying resource sciences in undergraduate institutions.

The program works. It is attracting high-caliber young men into resource fields, which is a major program objective. The 3-month summer employment program accomplishes what the sponsors and supporters of the Youth Conservation Corps contend can be accomplished for much larger numbers of other young people who need this kind of break.

The young men who participate in the league-Interior-Agriculture program I mention are employed under regular civil service rules. They must be 18 years old at the time they report to their work assignment.

This is necessarily a disappointment to many very capable and bright young men who graduate from high school at an earlier age, and so are not eligible for the program.

S. 1076, with its 14-18 age provision, meets this problem.

Another feature of S. 1076 we like is section 2(c), which provides a high degree of flexibility for the two secretaries in matters of lodging, subsistence, and other services.

This could mean a highly organized camp of 200 or more young people, where the work to be done and its location so dictate. On the other hand, it could mean a group of five or six on a trail crew working



out of a spike camp on a national forest ranger district. It could mean the assignment of one or two persons to a regular work crew.

Such flexibility would provide a greater opportunity to match an individual young person with the job and the work and living situation which would be of maximum value to him.

The Youth Conservation Corps would include young women as well as young men. There is every reason to believe that the program would offer equal benefits to young women.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Izaak Walton League supports the aims and purposes of S. 1076. We do not see it as an emergency program, but rather as one that should be continuing. It will produce substantial benefits year in and year out, because the resources involved—the natural resources of our public lands, and the natural resources of our young people—are not a sometime thing. They are a permanent, unending responsibility which we should never shirk.

Thank you for the privilege of expressing our views.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to congratulate you and the Izaak Walton League for the program you have referred to, in which you assist in the nomination of young men for participation during the summer months with both the Departments of Interior and Agriculture. I think this is an excellent program.

Mr. PENFOLD. It was Stewart Udall's idea, and we grabbed it.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good.

A number of these students are either doing graduate work or are employed by the Federal and State Governments in the resource field?

Mr. PENFOLD. That is right. We have not had the opportunity to make a complete survey of what has happened to all of these kids during the past 7 years, but a spot check indicates that they are going on to college, going on to graduate school, going into the resource agencies.

Most of them are being invited back for summer employment after they are in college. I am satisfied that it is really working.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate, too, your statement to the effect that you do not see it as an emergency program. I could not agree with you more. I think this is a program where the size may vary from time to time, based on what the national situation maybe. However, there is a continuing need for the work if we are going to properly manage our resources to see to it that they are available for public use and participation.

Mr. PENFOLD. There is certainly the continuing need for work in the resource field.

The CHAIRMAN. In some years there could be a need for a greater number of participants, but there is a continuing need, a minimum need, that should be met each year.

Mr. PENFOLD. And there will be a continuous supply of young people who need this kind of experience.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. PENFOLD. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We welcome your views.

The next witness will be Mr. Sam Studebaker, president, National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. We are delighted to have you with us this afternoon, Mr. Studebaker. You have come all the way from Ohio, I believe.

## STATEMENT OF SAM STUDEBAKER, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. STUDEBAKER. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

I am Sam Studebaker, of Tipp City, Ohio, a small town in western Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. How many people?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. Right now it is about, 5,000. It used to be about 1,500 to 2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. What is happening?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. We live right near Dayton, Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. You are being merged with the suburbs?

Mr. STUDEBAKER. I live in a rapidly urbanizing section of the country.

I do have an interest in this Senate bill 1076, as president of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

The members of this committee are familiar with soil and water conservation districts. There are now 3,012 of these districts which are organized in accordance with State laws.

Managed by over 18,000 men and women who contribute their time and effort, conservation districts work to conserve and develop land, water, forest, and wildlife resources on the privately owned lands of the Nation, and cooperate in the conservation of resources on publicly owned lands.

We believe that a Youth Conservation Corps would be an asset to the country. It has been our experience that young people are strongly interested in the resources that constitute our natural environment. Programs that our districts conduct with various youth organizations bear witness to this interest that young men and women take in projects involving the out-of-doors.

This experience has been amplified recently by the excellent record youngsters have made in hundreds of our districts which have participated in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. We have found them eager to learn and do something about conservation.

This was also amply demonstrated during the era of the Civilian Conservation Corps, when many youthful, and older, citizens engaged in productive resource work.

There are many reasons why formation of a Neighborhood Youth Corps is especially timely.

First is the need for young citizens to learn about their natural environment and the resources which support our economy.

As our population has moved from the country to the city, more and more of our people have become isolated from land and water, fish and wildlife, trees, and open space. A boy or girl growing up in the country has the chance to live with these resources and see their importance.

Youngsters in the city see only the end results, cartons of milk, boards at the hardware store, or water coming out of the faucet, and have little opportunity to become familiar with the web of nature and the actions of man that combine to produce these essential results.

A Youth Conservation Corps would provide youngsters with this opportunity. They would see resources in action. They would see some of the institutional arrangements that our Government uses to preserve, protect, and develop publicly owned resources.



They would acquire a sense of participation in the stewardship of land, water, and other resources which they own in common with their fellow citizens.

Our districts are vitally concerned with the need for resources and environmental education. We are working actively to incorporate resource studies in public and private school curriculums in every State.

A Youth Conservation Corps would help to advance this education goal substantially by giving more youngsters actual experience—the best kind of learning experience—with natural resources.

Second as a reason for establishing a Corps at this time is the growing magnitude of resource conservation needs.

Properly oriented, such a program will result in productive work that will help to preserve and protect resources.

Our public lands, wildlife refuges, parks, and national forests are being used for recreation and other purposes at a rapidly accelerating pace. This intensive use intensifies soil and water conservation problems on these properties. Protective vegetation is lost, erosion problems are magnified, and water disposal needs become more urgent. New facilities for recreational use are required.

There are other long-term resource needs on the public lands that require attention, such as revegetation, construction of runoff control measures, watershed protection, and cultural practices in forested areas.

Appropriations for work of this kind have not kept pace with the needs.

The Youth Conservation Corps would be an opportunity for constructive work of permanent value to the Nation. It would not make work. This would be the kind of work that young people can take pride in, that represents a substantial, practical, and lasting contribution to their country.

Members of the Youth Conservation Corps would be able to see the results of their labors—and this would help them to respect the value of their labor, and that of others.

We would urge, therefore, that the projects chosen be as meaningful as possible. If the Corps is to fulfill its highest objectives, the participants should have more than the chance to use a shovel and thereby collect a pay check. They need to understand why a gully-control device is needed, why a steep slope needs to be revegetated, and how the shrubs they plant will provide food and cover for wildlife. With this kind of understanding, they will take more pride in their accomplishments.

Third, there are advantages to be gained in learning good work habits as a youngster. Our society, in its growing affluence and technological development, removes more and more opportunities for meaningful work experiences from its younger members.

The Youth Conservation Corps would provide such experiences in healthful and wholesome surroundings. It is likely that many youngsters would become interested in a conservation career, thus helping in the recruiting of conservation professionals.

In our view, the Youth Conservation Corps is an excellent idea. It would have one shortcoming. Unlike the Civilian Conservation Corps, it would give youngsters experience only with resources on public lands. Most of the natural resources of the continental United States

are privately owned. In fact, three-quarters of the land of the 48 contiguous States is privately owned, mainly in the form of farms and ranches.

There are resource problems of considerable public significance on these private lands, as members of this committee realize. There are needs to help reduce erosion and sedimentation, pollution, floods, water shortages, poor forestry and wildlife measures, and other problems occurring on and originating from private lands. There are emerging conservation problems associated with urban expansion and the construction of our vast highway network.

We do not propose at this time that the Corps be expanded to provide for work in solving such problems on private lands, even though they would provide an opportunity to wrestle with the problem of achieving public purposes in cooperation with private enterprise in a democratic society. Perhaps such an expansion in the future could be useful, once experience is gained in the work on public lands.

At a minimum, however, we would hope that those administering the Corps would give some thought to bringing about an understanding of the relationship of the work being performed on public lands to resource needs on private lands. Demonstrations, field trips, and other techniques might help in bringing about this understanding. America is more than its magnificent public lands; it is the whole country.

We are happy to support S. 1076, and appreciate this opportunity to present our views.

The CHAIRMAN. We appreciate your statement, Mr. Studebaker.

I think you do have a point here that we could well call to the attention of the executive branch, namely the need to provide orientation programs which would acquaint the youngsters with the difficulties that we have in the private sector involving conservation. I think this is what you have in mind.

Mr. STUDEBAKER. That is what we had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Our first priority, of course, is to get a program going on Federal lands, and maybe we will learn something from that experience and can go on from there. In the meantime, we appreciate your unselfishness in supporting this.

I think if we are able to set up a successful program, it will have its impact well beyond what we now have in mind.

Mr. STUDEBAKER. I would like to say, Senator, in addition to the statement, the old CCC camp touched my family personally, and my youngest brother-in-law, who was a member of one of those. Actually, it really turned his life around.

There are unmeasured benefits, as was pointed out by earlier witnesses today. So much is said about the cost of these things, and so little is said about the benefits that we receive as a Nation from these efforts.

Another thing that I touched upon very lightly in the statement was the matter of young people learning to work. We have need on our farm for extra help in getting the hay in at times. We have so many young people who come to us and want a job to help get the hay in, but for one reason or another, they cannot be employed, because of their age, or because of the type of work. These fellows are losing an opportunity of learning how to work. If you see some of these boys who come out and try to handle a bale of hay, they just don't know how to tackle it.



That is what this Youth Conservation Corps would give these fellows, as I pointed out, a pride in the job they are doing, and an opportunity to learn how to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is a very good point. It is an excellent point.

I, of course, share your views about the old CCC. I find whether one is talking to a liberal audience, or a conservative audience, or a middle-of-the-road audience, when you mention the Civilian Conservation Corps, or if you take these youngsters off the streets during the summer months and put them to work in the out of doors, they stand up and cheer. It crosses all party affiliations and all attitudes about other controversial matters.

I have never seen such unanimity of support for doing something in this area. Of course, it has been aggravated in recent years, with the trouble in the large urban areas during the summer months. I think your point about pride of workmanship is very important.

Mr. STUDEBAKER. They are so bored they don't know what to do, and this gives them a chance to alleviate that boredom.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

The next witness is Mr. William Towell, executive vice president, American Forestry Association. We are glad to have you back with us again, Mr. Towell.

#### STATEMENT OF WILLIAM TOWELL, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION

Mr. TOWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a brief statement to make.

I am William E. Towell, executive vice president of the American Forestry Association, one of the Nation's oldest citizen conservation organizations, now totaling about 65,000 members. I appear in support of S. 1076.

There are a number of reasons, Mr. Chairman, why I am very enthusiastic about this bill. Let me begin by saying that the American Forestry Association played a key role in formulating the idea and promoting the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's depression era. The CCC was probably the most successful and popular of all the alphabet agencies, and did tremendous good for the youth of this country, as well as for conservation. In more recent years, we have been a strong supporter of the Job Corps Conservation Centers, which have performed a different but valuable service both for natural resources and for underprivileged young men of our country. The idea of combining conservation activity with other social and human objectives remains a good one.

The next thing that appeals to me about the Youth Conservation Corps proposal is the 90-day summer vacation limitation. This is a period of heavy use of public lands, and a time when temporary labor is urgently needed. Young men and women can be housed and fed without costly year-round camp facilities. It is the time of year that construction projects can proceed with a minimum of delays due to weather. Young men can be particularly helpful with firefighting activities, which often peak during the summer months in the North and West. A Youth Conservation Corps should provide many valu-

able accomplishments on our public lands that presently are neglected or inadequately handled.

And, finally, I see tremendous value in giving the youth of our country, particularly from the urban ghettos, an opportunity to study conservation first-hand. Many of the ills of our society, I believe, are due to the loss of contact between people and the land. A Youth Conservation Corps would expand upon the time proven methods employed so successfully by Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and Camp Fire Girls in teaching boys and girls to understand and appreciate nature. The future of our country and the world depends upon young generations developing a better understanding of the relationships between people and the environment.

There is one other point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman.

For a number of years, as an employer of people engaged in conservation work, I was confronted with the very, very difficult task of trying to hand out a very limited number of summer jobs to a tremendous number of applicants, particularly in the lower age brackets. We just would not hire the high school age group. I think this is the group that needs the encouragement of summer employment. In my thinking, this is a real opportunity to fill a big gap in meaningful, gainful occupation in an age group that now has a very difficult time.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you like the emphasis here in the bill on the group being 14- to 18-year-olds.

Mr. TOWELL. Very much so.

Once they get into college, whatever their specialty training might be, they don't have too hard a time in finding summer employment, but it is the high school groups, those who have not established any skills, any background of experience that need the employment badly, and it is very hard to find jobs for them.

I would have maybe five or six hundred applications for maybe a half dozen summer jobs, when I was director of conservation in Missouri. It is very exasperating not to have the opportunity to take care of these people.

The CHAIRMAN. And this is the danger period, too, 14 to 18.

Mr. TOWELL. It is certainly the most formative stages.

The CHAIRMAN. And the youngsters that you can reclaim during this time frame of 14 to 18, I think, will be more meaningful than at a later period. After they are older, you are trying to undo something that has already caused irreparable harm.

Mr. TOWELL. This is my thinking. I think the age limit bracket is one of the most important parts of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mrs. Orville Freeman, representing the Girl Scouts of America. We are delighted to welcome you to the committee, Mrs. Freeman.

#### STATEMENT OF MRS. ORVILLE FREEMAN, GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mrs. FREEMAN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Your husband is one of our great conservationists. I am delighted to see that you are carrying on the tradition, both while he was in office and now while you are both in private life.



Mrs. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Mrs. Orville L. Freeman of Chevy Chase, Md., and a member of the National Board of Directors of Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., a nationwide organization with a membership of 3,265,000 girls and over 660,000 adults.

We would like to place on file with the statement which I am making in behalf of our organization a copy of our letter of April 11 to the Honorable Henry M. Jackson, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This letter endorses the creation of a Youth Conservation Corps through pending bill S. 1076.

The creation of a Youth Conservation Corps at this time will be most welcome to Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. We believe that there is need to more fully involve young people in the management of the forest, park, wildlife, watershed, and recreation lands upon which our civilization depends.

This is particularly important for urbanized young people who have limited opportunities to appreciate the values of the out of doors and of natural resources.

Love of nature and a healthy environment resulting from wise land management practices can be learned from favorable experiences, not from speeches, sermons, or textbooks. It is through increased exposure to actual conservation experiences that young people will learn to make wise resource management decisions.

I might add that we found in our work in planning and carrying out the program for the National Youth Conservation Conference, which was held here in Washington in 1966, which we helped to sponsor, and in the followup work on that, that the young people were capable of doing a great deal more of planning and management than many adults had been ready to give them credit for being able to do.

They were concerned about the basic, serious problems of conservation, not just the business of planting petunias. It was very impressive to see what they were capable of doing.

The CHAIRMAN. That was a misidentification concerning them.

Mrs. FREEMAN. Absolutely. But also there is a lot more wisdom and management ability than I think we find in many adults.

As evidence that girl scouting supports the aims of this bill, we are in the process of securing a new National Center West which will be approximately 13,000 acres near Ten Sleep, Wyo., and adjacent to the Big Horn National Forest. On this site, Girl Scouts is developing a laboratory in the out of doors, where young people can learn and can teach other young people about the good life.

Young people need to become sharply aware that human living and growing is more than living and growing in the city. They need experience in discovering for themselves that knowledge of anthropology, ecology, geology, geography, and history of nonurban areas can help us learn why we live and work where we do.

It would probably teach a lot of them that they want to get out of the cities, too.

Nearby university facilities and graduate students in these fields will help on this Western Center site.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. is especially happy that girls are included in plans for the Youth Conservation Corps. The women of our Nation will continue to influence greatly conservation policies through direct action and through family relationships.

Also, today's girls join with boys in taking part in outdoor maintenance projects. They want equal involvement and equal citizenship responsibilities in conservation.

So many of these programs in the past have not included women. We are delighted that you are at this time considering it.

The Youth Conservation Corps will provide training and learning outlets for young women and young men.

The Girl Scout organization views this proposal with the hope that it will be one in which youth organizations such as ours can either nominate or select candidates for participation in conservation projects during the summer.

If the pending bill is extended—and I understand from the statement you made a moment ago that this must start slowly, as a pilot project, but we assume it will be very successful, and then will go on to be expanded—if it does expand, members can be assigned to sites such as our National Center West, or other privately owned lands.

Our new National Center West includes lands made possible by the Recreation and Public Purpose Act. We will be happy to make our center available under the program. This extension of the bill would render a service of inestimable value to girl scouting. In return, Youth Conservation Corps members so assigned could appropriately participate in broad summer programs taking place beginning in July 1970.

We feel also we might help the young people who might work on our center with participation in a broad program of summer activities in addition to the immediate conservation project.

The CHAIRMAN. We might be able to take, on a prototype basis, some of the girls in connection with work in Federal areas, to start with.

I would hope that for both the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts we may be able to include some of them this summer, if we are able to get the legislation passed by the Congress.

Mrs. FREEMAN. I am sure we would welcome that, very much.

The CHAIRMAN. That might be a possibility.

Then, of course, we would have to amend this bill to deal with the other matter.

Mrs. FREEMAN. We just wanted to propose this, looking a little bit ahead, and also feeling that perhaps some of our trained personnel would be useful in supervision and in training many of the Youth Conservation Corps people.

The CHAIRMAN. Right.

Mrs. FREEMAN. The intent of this bill is to bring together through this project not just underprivileged young people, not just school dropouts, and still further not just the average teenager, but rather to bring together young people of our total society. Our organization is so enthused that we are here today to publicly state our support of the proposed Youth Conservation Corps. I must say I think this is one of the most important parts of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. I am happy to hear you say that. I think this is one of the best ways to help the underprivileged, to mix them with the other youngsters from all walks of our society.

Mrs. FREEMAN. Exactly. If ever there was a need in our democracy today, as I see it, it is that we have every grounds possible for the people in the various walks of our society to meet one another.



In his last speech, Adlai Stevenson said:

"We travel together, passengers on a little space ship, dependent on its vulnerable supplies of air and soil \* \* \* preserved from annihilation only by the care, the work, and I will say the love, we give our fragile craft."

A Youth Conservation Corps will allow our young people to give care, work, and love to our fragile craft—the earth.

Let us hope you really have a chance to go forward.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We appreciate your statement. It is very helpful.

The letter will be included in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
New York, N.Y., April 11, 1969.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Mrs. Holton R. Price, Jr., President of Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., has asked me to reply in her behalf to your letter of April 4 regarding the proposed Youth Conservation Corps.

We are most interested in your proposal which would make such significant opportunities in conservation and outdoor living available to youth. Since the Girl Scout organization acted as the Coordinator for the National Youth Conference on Natural Beauty and Conservation between 1966 and 1968 in which the eleven major national youth organizations participated, we do know of the intense interest and ability of youth to carry out conservation projects and service to society. We are attaching a copy of the Report of the Conference to the Nation and a copy of "Youth Power," a description of the follow-up of the Conference by youth groups.

The Girl Scout Organization views your proposal as one in which youth organizations such as ours could either nominate or select candidates for participation in meaningful conservation duties during the summer. It would offer exciting opportunities to young people.

We want to express a hope, too, that consideration be given to an expansion of the bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to approve land areas not under their direct administration where the Youth Conservation Corps could render service. For example, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. is in the process of securing a new National Center West which will be approximately 13,000 acres near Ten Sleep, Wyoming and adjacent to the Big Horn National Forest.

Portions of this new site have been secured from the State, from the Federal Government and through private purchase. Only because of the Recreation and Public Purpose Act have some of these lands become available to us, since it is recognized these lands are to serve public, recreational purposes. If the pending bill is extended so that the proposed Youth Conservation Corps members could be assigned to sites such as ours, we would be happy to make it available under the program. It would render a service of inestimable value to Girl Scouting and in return the Youth Conservation Corps members so assigned could approximately participate in broad summer programs taking place there. This is a site where we see all classes of society meeting together and carrying out meaningful summer programs. For your interest we have included a pamphlet on our new National Center West site.

We thank you too for the invitation to participate in the hearing on April 21 in the afternoon. Regretfully, Mrs. Price has a previous commitment on that date. However, Mrs. Sally B. Cortner, our Washington representative, will be in touch with your office to arrange for one of our National Board members to speak in our behalf at your hearing.

Sincerely yours,

LOUISE A. WOOD,  
National Executive Director.

Mrs. FREEMAN. We have also submitted copies, for your information and that of the committee, of the "Report to the Nation, National Youth Conference on National Beauty and Conservation," and a copy of "Youth Power," which is the followup report, which really has some marvelous examples of what young people have done in working with adults, too, in their communities, and finally, a few copies of our own Girl Scout Conservation pamphlet, which we use in trying to help our various Girl Scout troops and leaders to have ideas of the kinds of things that they can do. All of these ideas really have come from the experiences of other troops. I think copies of these have been made available to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The staff informs me that they are all here.

You have made a very fine addition to the discussion today, Mrs. Freeman. I want to congratulate you and the Girl Scouts of America for your presentation.

Mrs. FREEMAN. Thank you. If there is any way that we can be helpful in obtaining passage of the bill, we will be delighted.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. George Freeman, representing the Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Freeman, I think it is appropriate that the Boy Scouts should follow the Girl Scouts. We are delighted to welcome you.

#### STATEMENT OF GEORGE FREEMAN, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to express the appreciation of the Boy Scouts of America for this opportunity to testify.

The Boy Scout movement has considerable experience in the area of conservation education. This field, in fact, has been a part of the Cub Scout, Boy Scout, and Explorer programs since the inception of the Boy Scout movement.

The committee may be interested that conservation is one of the advancement requirements for Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts.

The national Boy Scout organization operates three conservation training camps annually. More than 150 of our 503 local councils operate their own conservation training camps, and most of the other councils have some program of conservation education and conservation projects.

We annually conduct a series of national camping schools for training and indoctrination of camp staff members, and this experience includes the training of conservation staff personnel.

At our home office, in New Brunswick, N.J., we operate a year-round conservation education center, with an annual attendance of nearly 70,000 persons. An assistant national director of camping with Boy Scouts of America is a specialist in the field of conservation, and the national director of conservation for the BSA.

The committee might be interested in that part of the merit badge program of the Boy Scouts of America that relates to conservation education. For instance, in the past 5 years, more than 200,000 boys qualified for merit badges in soil and water conservation, more than 100,000 in fish and wildlife conservation, and more than 90,000 in forestry.



In the past 3 years, more than 98,000 boys earned merit badges on the subject of conservation of natural resources.

Our future plans include the expansion of local council conservation training camps, a nationwide conservation good turn in 1971, a major conservation program at the forthcoming National Boy Scout Jamboree in Idaho in July of this year, greater emphasis on conservation education in all of the 650 local council Boy Scout camps attended by some 800,000 boys each summer.

The CHAIRMAN. How many merit badges have you now?

Mr. FREEMAN. Slightly in excess of 100.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't recall those that you just referred to in the days when I was in Scouting.

Mr. FREEMAN. No, sir; they have not been available for too long. We also have space exploration available.

A recent innovation in conservation education, and still in the pilot study area, undertaken by the Boy Scouts of America was started in 1968. The National Boy Scouts of America financed a conservation training program for a 2-week period in four local councils for disadvantaged boys. There were 63 boys in each of the four 2-week periods. In 1969, the program will be extended to 10 local councils.

With schools in five areas, the Boy Scouts of America is planning a conservation training program for high school dropouts, and this will be conducted in September and October.

Three or four years ago, Vice President Humphrey asked all of the youth-serving agencies to accept a challenge to give 25,000 disadvantaged boys a long-term camping experience. In the first year of this project, the Boy Scouts of America, alone, identified and sent more than 25,000 disadvantaged boys to summer camp. Last year we sent 50,000. Our goal this coming summer is 75,000.

These figures do not include the many thousands of disadvantaged boys who also attend Boy Scout camps as members of their established hometown Boy Scout units.

While it is not the role of the Boy Scouts to promote or to oppose legislation, certainly the Boy Scouts of America is interested in youth, and we are interested in conservation. We are interested in any constructive program that would help interest more young people in conserving the natural resources of our Nation.

Having recorded this interest, perhaps the greatest service that I might render to the committee on behalf of the Boy Scouts would be to make a few observations based upon our experience in working with youth, in conducting camp programs, and in promoting conservation, and to possibly raise some questions that should be considered by your committee in connection with the proposed legislation.

We concur heartily in the general intent of the bill, and applaud the proposal that the program be open to all socioeconomic backgrounds, for certainly the conservation of our natural resources should be the concern of all citizens.

I would now wish to share with you some of the thoughts that are an outgrowth of our experience in the field of conducting conservation education camps, and the conservation program generally.

The committee should realize that once such training camps are started, those operating them will be responsible for these young people 24 hours a day. Our experience has been that boys and young

men can absorb only 3 to 4 hours a day of a workday of intensive conservation, and we have structured our programs to fill the rest of the time with study and recreation.

In fact, there would seem to be three major aspects involved:

1. The learning experience of relating to the conservation of natural resources. In such an experience, the program would require that those who conduct this phase have the ability to teach, have a wide background of conservation, and be able to establish a rapport with the young participants.

2. A practical work program of conservation is also involved, and this would require technicians who would also need the ability to establish proper rapport.

3. The third aspect would be the practical problems—the interpersonal relationships, the recreational facilities and programs required to constructively hold the interest and occupy the time of the participants.

In each of the above three areas, high caliber, experienced leadership is vital to the success of the program.

Our many years of experience in the field of conservation, camping, and interpersonal relationships indicates that it is not practical to try to hold the interest in content of activity or duration of an age span from 14 to 18 years of age.

We would suggest, in fact, that 14 may be too young an age to take boys or girls away from their home environment for a period that could range up to 90 days, and would further suggest the same might pertain to 15-year-olds.

We would raise the question as to whether there might be opportunities for major youth-serving agencies to participate on an organized basis in such a program under governmental auspices.

As a specific, might there be an opportunity for Explorer Conservation Posts—these are Explorer posts whose major interest is in the field of conservation—to participate as an organized unit for 2 weeks.

Some Scouter members of this committee might well make the observation that many Explorer posts do include 14- and 15-year-olds. We believe there is a major difference between camping boys from a close knit, well established unit, with a known leader, from camping such youth as a heterogeneous group under new and strange leadership.

I think you answered the question I just raised about participation of organized youth by serving agencies.

Again, with reference to the problems attendant to a wide divergency of age, may we respectfully suggest that the Boy Scouts and other youth-serving agencies might find an opportunity within the framework of such a bill to intensify their present efforts in the area of conservation and conservation camps for 14- and 15-year-olds, both Scout and non-Scout, under scholarships provided through this program.

Another concern that we would share with you, at least as far as our experience indicates, is that a relatively good job of instilling interest in conservation as well as teaching methods and skills might be done in 2 weeks, and that any longer period may result in drudgery to the young people, with diminished learning returns.

It is only fair to concede that because our experiences have not involved the paying of the participants, but to the contrary, the partici-



pants have paid their own way, we are not in a position to say whether an ongoing pay scale would alter this condition.

We would see the role of the Boy Scouts of America as one of referring qualified candidates, and making available, as possible, our experience in conservation education, camping, recreation, and the interpersonal relationships of young people.

We thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, for this opportunity to express our views.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very fine statement.

My comments, of course, with regard to the Girl Scouts apply equally to the Boy Scouts.

I was interested in your comment about the age bracket starting at 14. I was going to ask Mrs. Freeman how she felt about that. The point has been made by Mr. Freeman that maybe 14 is too young.

Mrs. FREEMAN. Our experience in Girl Scout camps shows that many 14-year-old girls would profit greatly and would be all right away from home or parents.

I think again it is a selection process, so that those you take, particularly the young ones, would be rather carefully selected.

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I qualify my earlier comment?

We, too, of course, have tens of thousands of 14-year-olds attend camp. They do, however, attend as members of a homogeneous group, with known leadership. Where we have attempted in national conservation camps to mix 14-, 15-, 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds, it has not quite worked out so well.

You allayed some of my concerns earlier in speaking to something related to this.

It may well be that the two related governmental departments in working out the details might well decide that they might have a camp for 14- and 15-year-olds, which would present an entirely different situation as far as the Boy Scouts are concerned. We have had good experience.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is a very good point. This is all the more reason why we should initiate this program on a trial basis, and try as many different combinations as possible, so that we can get some experience.

Of course, there are other programs we can draw from—the Scout programs, for example, where the people you have in Girl Scouts and in the Boy Scouts have had experience in this area.

I think there is an advantage here of maybe putting the 14- and 15-year-olds in one category and the 16- and 17-year-olds in another category. Again, this depends on the selection process, does it not?

Mr. FREEMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. This also includes the kind of people who are administering the program and the participants who are sharing in it.

Your statement has been very helpful, and we have made a special note on both of the suggestions.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness is Mr. Louis Clapper, Chief, Conservation Education Department, National Wildlife Federation. We are delighted to have you with us, Mr. Clapper.

**STATEMENT OF LOUIS CLAPPER, DIRECTOR OF CONSERVATION,  
NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION**

Mr. CLAPPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am Louis S. Clapper, director of conservation for the National Wildlife Federation, which has national headquarters at 1412 16th Street, NW., here in Washington, D.C.

Ours is a private organization which seeks to attain conservation goals through educational means. The federation has affiliates in 49 States. These affiliates, in turn, are made up of local groups and individuals who, when combined with associate members and other supporters of the National Wildlife Federation, number an estimated  $2\frac{1}{4}$  million persons.

The National Wildlife Federation is pleased and honored that you have invited us to appear today to present our views on the Youth Conservation Corps, as would be established by S. 1076.

Mr. Chairman, from the time it was organized, the National Wildlife Federation has been interested and concerned about conservation education and the futures of young Americans. We believe that a Youth Conservation Corps such as that which would be established by S. 1076 can have widespread benefits for a country beset by a growing population and youth-oriented disturbances.

Some of these benefits are of the direct type which can be evaluated by economic yardsticks. Other benefits are not of this type and must be judged as intangibles.

For the purpose of providing background information, I should point out that the National Wildlife Federation supported the old Civilian Conservation Corps, the depression-born agency which resulted in the creation of many of the present day State parks and forests, wildlife refuges, and fishing lakes.

This Corps also resulted in the training of many national leaders, including some Members of the Congress.

The late Ernest F. Swift, former Executive Director of our organization, wrote of the CCC with a nostalgic fondness, and a copy of his article, which appeared in the April-May 1968, issue of National Wildlife Magazine, is attached.

The CHAIRMAN. The point has been made over and over again that this is one of those alphabetical agencies that has really been effective.

Mr. CLAPPER. That is correct. Many of the State parks, State forests, and State lakes are still in operation that these men constructed and provided. Portions of this original program were incorporated into the present-day Job Corps, as related to the conservation camp projects. We are confident that this same procedure can work well with the variations recommended by S. 1076.

This bill relates the project to younger persons of both sexes between the ages of 14 and 18, who would be employed for summer periods of not more than 90 days.

As we see it, the proposed Youth Conservation Corps would have these primary benefits and values:

1. Young people participating in the program would be kept out of trouble during the summer periods, with their energies channeled into useful activities—an effort of value to the public.

2. Activities of the Corps would be directed into the construction or maintenance of facilities such as trails, water control structures,



campgrounds, and lakes, plus work in forest reseeding, fire control, wildlife management, et cetera.

In this manner, the general public will benefit from the accomplishment of a part of the huge backlog of work that needs completion.

3. Perhaps the great benefits, however, would be realized by the young people who participate, and not primarily from any wages they might earn.

For residents of an inner city, a summer spent in a national park or forest or wildlife refuge could be the most broadening experience of their lives. Urbanologists say that the only birds which some of these youngsters have ever seen are pigeons or starlings, the only wild mammals they know are rats and mice, the only streams they ever have seen are heavily polluted with human offal and industrial wastes.

All of the participants, regardless of their origin, however, can gain a new appreciation of the basic resources and values upon which this Nation's strength and wealth are based.

Pride in their country should be stimulated. They also would learn to be independent and have an opportunity to develop working methods and attitudes which would remain with them as adults in colleges or in the general business community.

One unique thing about this proposal is that it will not be limited to any particular economic, social, or racial background.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to inject one personal note. My eldest son turned 18 last spring. Having applied early, he was fortunate enough to land a summer job in a forest in Colorado. He made the trip out and back by himself. He found his own lodgings and arranged for food, laundry, and other details.

He performed recreation area garbage cleanup, marked trees, repaired trails, and even performed a bit of firefighting. On one weekend, he visited the ranch of a Spanish-American coworker and helped brand calves.

All of these were first-time experiences for him. His horizons were broadened, his attitudes were matured, he had experiences he shall never forget.

These things, we hope and trust, will help him as he enters military service.

It is our understanding that the Department of the Interior each year has applications for summer jobs which run into the tens of thousands, and this indicates the widespread interest in this type of program.

I was told one time that an entire room at the Department of the Interior was set aside for these stacks of applications.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a new phenomenon in recent years, not only in the out-of-doors, but in congressional offices, committee offices, and the executive branches of the Government.

It is an encouraging sign for those who want to do something gainful in the summer months.

We cannot possibly take care of the number of applicants just from the State of Washington for work here on Capitol Hill.

Mr. CLAPPER. That is right. But this does indicate the type of widespread interest in the program, and we feel it would be quite popular.

In conclusion, we agree with the principles set out in S. 1076, and hope the committee will see fit to issue a favorable report on it.

Thank you for the opportunity of making these remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The article by Mr. Swift will be placed into the record at this point. Thank you very much, Mr. Clapper.

(The article referred to follows:)

#### STRAIGHT TALK

(By Ernie Swift)

The CCC camps of the '30's—The Civilian Conservation Corps—are now but a nostalgic memory to many staid businessmen who as boys eagerly enlisted to invade the forests, plains, farmlands and mountains as living symbols of one of our greatest conservation movements.

The CCC camps were one answer to the worst depression and the worst drouth that ever befell this nation. When the depression hit in the late '20's, people lost their businesses, factories and jobs, the banks closed, there were bread lines and suicides.

In great part the CCC camps were a social experiment and a morale builder to overcome the nation's fear of fear. In the matter of weeks three million idle and bewildered boys from Brooklyn to Podunk were put to work shoring up the nation's natural resources. The job was three edged: to build confidence and character, to bring financial aid to their distressed families, to start a gigantic natural resources restoration program.

And so the job was begun. Fuzzy cheeked kids in blue fatigues, their first square meal in months under their belts, were hiking out to their assignments with axes, shovels and picks. They did range rehabilitation work, improved wells and springs, built corrals and fences, stock trails and roads, filled in eroded gullies; they worked on federal and state forests and parks, gathered fish spawn, built hatcheries, and some tried their hand at masonry and carpentry. By the sweat of their collective brows these future voters proved among other points that forest fires could be stopped. Three million boys working and playing, breathing the pure, sweet air of a Great America, and learning to swagger in the fierce joy of accomplishment and coming manhood. Thousands of youngsters who commenced as enlistees grew up as doctors, lawyers, engineers, and professional conservationists.

The CCC lit a beacon throughout the nation that is still burning; they were a milestone in the nation's history both as a social experiment and in the development of a national conservation conscience. Their lasting accomplishments preceded the present Job Corps program.

The recruitment for the Job Corps does not compare in numbers with the old CCC camps but then the situation is completely different today. Also, their living conditions are far more plush, they lack the military discipline of the old camps and the training is more sophisticated with the emphasis on resources being generally secondary. Having observed several of the Job Corps camps from their inception it is my hope that they can equal the old CCC camps as character builders where boys sweated, learned, were disciplined, developed a fine sense of esprit de corps and a new sense of values.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness will be Mr. William B. Pond, executive officer, National Recreation & Parks Association.

#### STATEMENT OF WILLIAM B. POND, EXECUTIVE OFFICER, NATIONAL RECREATION & PARKS ASSOCIATION

Mr. POND. I am William B. Pond, executive officer of the National Recreation & Park Association, with headquarters at 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.

The association is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to the wise use of free time, conservation of natural resources, and beautification of the American environment.

We support the objectives of this bill, and we believe that the program it would authorize is a practical and useful one.

It would provide a valuable training experience for young people at a time in their lives when such training is very important. It would



provide useful employment for them during the summer months when, without the kind of opportunities that the Youth Conservation Corps could offer them, jobs would otherwise be unavailable.

It would provide an opportunity for constructive experience in preserving and protecting our natural resources. It would provide benefits in the maintenance and operation of public reservations of the kinds for which there is great need.

Because we believe that the program envisioned has such merit, we recommend that the committee consider extending the scope of the bill to include not only the lands under the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, but also State and local parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and similar types of State and local reservations, especially those State and local areas, or State lands, for example, which have been given by the Federal Government, or particularly at the local level where Federal funds have been used to acquire such property, such as the land and water conservation fund, the open spaces, and so forth.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, you are well aware that many of the federally owned projects today, particularly those that involve water development and the surrounding areas, are federally owned, federally financed, but very often, as a part of Federal policy, these are turned over to local jurisdictions on a contractual basis for operation.

We think it would be most appropriate that at some future date these properties also be included in the enabling portion of the bill.

If the program is authorized and extended to State and local areas, many more young people would be within easy reach of the public areas, such as city and county parks, where they might work during the day and return to their homes at night.

I believe that nearly all urban-dwelling parents of teenage children would agree that the 3 months of summer are a particularly critical time for their youngsters. If the families are sufficiently affluent, they may solve the problem by sending the children to summer camps. If they cannot afford to do that—and the majority of urban families cannot afford it—a very real problem exists in finding enough jobs to keep the youngsters reasonably busy, and, at the same time, keep them in a wholesome environment.

In public parks and forests, there are many kinds of relatively unskilled jobs that the young people could perform, which would be both useful to these public reservations and instructive experience for the young people, and which might not otherwise be done.

Many public facilities, such as picnic tables, park benches, foot trails, horse trails, fences, shelters, and other structures need maintenance. Particularly in local parks, shrubs, trees, and grass need care, flower beds need tending and replanting. There are never enough employees on any park staff to provide adequate pickup and cleanup.

Public use areas tend to erode unless there is proper and adequate maintenance. Soil erosion once started is hard to stop. If not prevented or stopped early, repair becomes very costly. Signs, trail side exhibits, museums, and historic structures require their particular kinds of maintenance.

Some time ago, I was in a recreation situation in suburban Portland serving a community of some 30,000. One summer I kept track, and I had 564 contacts by parents, not by young people, but by parents. This did not include the young people contacting me. They were

requesting if there was not some way whereby their high school students could receive some sort of a job experience.

I think this serves to demonstrate the need for what we are talking about today.

Teenage young people engaged in these kinds of work on farms and around their homes as a matter of course, when the population of our country was largely rural. It was healthy occupation, it brought a sense of responsibility, and the benefits of such work were taken for granted, all as normal activities in the lives of growing young people.

Crowded life in cities has changed all of that, as we all know. The proposed Youth Conservation Corps could restore these work and training opportunities and experiences in significant measure.

I want to support Mr. Twardzik's testimony of the interest not only of our colleges and universities, but of the students themselves.

The National Recreation & Parks Association will work closely with students in this field. We are in close contact with them in their programs, and in the practical work type experiences which these young people perform in obtaining their college experience. We know that these people would be available to be of assistance at any time.

We recognize that an essential element in the program would be adequate supervision. We do not believe that that is an insurmountable problem. Schoolteachers, college students, graduate students, and retired people, among others, could be employed as supervisors and, perhaps, many capable people would be willing to serve as supervisors on a voluntary basis.

With reference to housing and shelter for the Conservation Corps enrollees, those within easy reach of their homes could live at home and work during the day, as I stated earlier, and those who are required to work in more remote areas could be inexpensively housed in tents, as summer employees have been housed in parks and forests for many decades.

We believe that the cost of the proposed Youth Conservation Corps program is the kind of investment in the welfare of our young people that our country can afford, and that the proposed program is especially timely and appropriate in our presently predominantly urban civilization.

Thank you for the opportunity of appearing today.

The CHAIRMAN. Yours is a very, very fine statement. We certainly appreciate your support, and that of the national association.

We will see what we can do at the Federal level, first, on a pilot basis, and then explore the other suggestions that you have later. That might be one possible start, that is, where there is some previous Federal connection.

Mr. POND. Mr. Chairman, it is not in our statement, but I am sure that we would support the idea of the demonstration project, getting this off the ground. We do think it would be extremely important, as you have suggested, that in the pilot type of program you explore as many different kinds of ways of going about this job as possible, and that real criteria and critique come out of this which would help in the further programs.

The CHAIRMAN. That is certainly helpful. We appreciate your suggestion very much.

Mr. POND. Thank you.



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to acknowledge statements and letters from various organizations, State officials, and educators, and other individuals concerning this legislation. We are pleased to have them and all will be incorporated in the record at this point.

(The communications referred to follow:)

STATEMENT BY OWEN B. KIERNAN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to offer a brief statement in support of S. 1076, concerned with the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. The members of the NASSP include principals of high schools, junior high schools, and other secondary schools, both public and private, as well as persons professionally associated with the problems of secondary education in the state departments of education and on college and university campuses—a total membership of nearly 35,000. Also, I am drawing on my own experience as Commissioner of Education for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from 1957 to 1968.

The principals in our large urban and suburban secondary schools have guidance counselors assisting them in locating summer employment opportunities for their students. In small town and rural schools this becomes one of the multitude of functions carried out by the principal himself. All of these administrators are keenly aware of the problems faced by teen-age youth in their efforts to find employment in the summer that is both meaningful and gainful. For the past several summers NASSP members have been called upon to assist with the work of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, with some locally rewarding results. We are aware that the National Council of Businessmen, working in some 25 of the largest cities, found approximately 141,000 jobs for unemployed youth last summer. We know that the State of Colorado has developed a Colorado Conservation Corps under the auspices of its Game, Fish, and Parks Commission, and that other efforts are underway to get city children and youth out to rural areas for summer jobs and outdoor recreation. But we are cognizant, also, that these efforts only amount to a drop in the bucket compared to current national needs.

I need not remind this committee that school principals all over the country are having a rough year because of increasingly serious militancy and unrest. Activist student groups are making demands, sensible and otherwise, which school administrators frequently are not in a position to meet. One of these concerns meaningful work experiences. One recurrent theme runs through all this agitation—our students are fearful of the future and uncertain of what life in the latter years of this century has in store for them. They feel that the adult society is not meeting the challenge inherent in the increasing imbalance between population growth and the use of our national resources. Some of the older among them appear fearful of military requirements as they approach the age to be drafted. Others read of the problems of air and water pollution and dwindling natural assets in soil, minerals, forest areas, and wildlife, and wonder what can be done about them.

The basic proposal contained in S. 1076 is a sound one, we believe. It is one which should go a long way toward satisfying the craving of youths who are fortunate enough to have the experience of involvement in something constructive and relevant to their own lives. There is a great deal of complaining these days from our restless youth that traditional curricula do not meet this craving.

We would hope, however, that this committee, after hearing whatever testimony is brought to it by administrative spokesmen, businessmen, and schoolmen, would amend the bill to be more specific and spell out in detail both the immediate objectives and the overall dimensions of the program. The bill does not reveal whether it is designed particularly for disadvantaged urban youth, as are so many current programs, or whether it will be a daytime or a residential program. Yet these are questions which parents will want the answers to right away, and on the answers depend other considerations concerning the recruitment of eligible youth and suitable instructors.

As educators we would like to know whether consideration has been given to the time which must be devoted to instructing the youth on the the purposes of conservation and the tasks they are being asked to perform. Not many of today's high school students have acquired the skills with hand tools that would

be required, and 90 days is not very long to become adept at new skills. If the program is to provide primarily a learning experience it will require qualified teachers to conduct it, but if it is to be essentially a work experience, similar to many of the Job Corps projects, it will need a different group of instructors. Additionally, only a few of the more mature high school students are trained, or strong enough, to handle the motorized equipment used these days for trail building, dam construction, and similar conservation work.

Without decisions on such matters it would be difficult to work out meaningful cost estimates. A daytime work experience for youth who travel to the site of the project by bus from a not too distant city would be one thing; a residential camp would be another and obviously much more expensive. Our country has had considerable experience with such projects in recent years. They tend to be very costly at first and some have met with failure. Another consideration is that when conservation projects are completed in one area, new projects will have to be opened elsewhere. No specified authorization appears in the bill, so it is difficult to envisage how much of a program is contemplated, or how much the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior will have to work with in drawing up the initial plans.

Most of the States of the Union require all students to take some courses, or study some instructional material, in what is variously called civics, citizenship, or problems of democracy. Some of these, but not all, include material on conservation, natural resources, the man-land ratio, and other related subjects. We are constantly being reminded that we are at a point in time when our resources are being consumed, or polluted, at much too fast a rate. I am not certain as to the extent to which this kind of current material has been incorporated into social studies courses. But I do not fear contradiction when I state that practical experience on a conservation project is a better teacher than a passage in a textbook, read in a crowded schoolroom a thousand miles away. Granting that it will take time to develop a workable plan for carrying out the main purpose of S. 1076, and that it will require substantial funding, I can nevertheless assert unequivocally that the program is potentially very valuable both to the students fortunate enough to take part, and to the country as a whole. Unquestionably, it will enlarge the number of citizens who think in terms of the preservation, and the rational utilization, of our natural heritage.

Beyond the benefits stated above, I am confident the committee has considered the staggering costs of no program for these youth. James B. Conant has described as "social dynamite" the thousands of out-of-school and unoccupied youth wandering aimlessly on the city streets of this nation. My testimony cannot match the eloquence of Dr. Conant, but I subscribe completely to his assessment of a potentially explosive situation. Recently, I completed a world assignment covering over 51,000 miles, and I can attest to the fact of militancy, unrest and violence in every corner of the globe. We, however, have one outstanding advantage—a concerned Congress which is willing to consider ways and means of getting youth on the right track and keeping them there. S. 1076 provides for a vigorous step in this direction.

---

STATEMENT OF DR. CLAUDE URY, EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANT, KENSINGTON, CALIF.

Senator Jackson: I should like very much to present my views as an Educational Consultant concerning your proposed bill which would create a Youth Conservation Corps.

The Civilian Conservation Corps was the greatest blessing ever to come to the forests, soils, and waters of this country. It will go down in American History as a great and worthwhile achievement in conservation of natural resources, in human conservation and also as an experiment in practical training and education of youth.

The situation of youth employment is a matter of serious concern not only on the national level, but of virtually every State and local government as well. There is not a State legislature or a city council meeting today that is not confronted with the necessity to forestall going ahead with vitally needed conservation and youth employment programs because of a drought of funds.

This legislation in my opinion will provide an investment in the restoration, preservation and these resources accomplishing the same gains as the Civilian Conservation Corps did, but because we have the experience of the past from which we can profit, doing them better.

I look upon the Youth Conservation Corps as a capital investment from which we can confidently predict future returns. It has long been recognized that ex-



penditures which increase or protect our tangible assets soil, water, vegetation, wildlife, and living space contribute directly to the capacity of our country to produce goods and services. Some forms of investment in resources do not yield immediate income it takes a long time to stabilize eroded land and to revegetate it, and a long time is required for seedlings to grow into a forest. But many conservation projects yield return quickly, such as investment in recreational developments and these will be of increasing importance as the nation becomes more urban.

As a nation we have not been making the necessary investment to guide these young people back into the mainstream of productive American life.

Nowhere on the American scene is there more need for action programs of youth employment than on those lands occupied by Indians. New roads to spur commercial development, wells to improve the health standards of a region, range and soil improvement programs and development of recreational facilities that can provide new sources of income.

The Youth Conservation Corps can make a contribution to the archeological studies of the Southwest. We have never had enough help in excavation work; where hand tools and manpower are needed.

Our forest lands in all classes of ownership have 40 million acres in need of reforestation, and at least 150 million acres more are overcrowded, diseased, insect-infested, or are of low-quality second growth timber. We have an enormous backlog of requirements to initiate an adequate program of tree planting, thinning, pruning, insect and disease control, and fire prevention measures.

In the Southeastern United States there are more than 11 million acres in the public forests alone. If this expanse of timbered land could be thinned of worthless scrub oak, releasing young pine for normal growth, pulpwood harvest could begin in 10 years and continue on an annual basis.

Some of the major work projects in public and other lands owned by the Federal Government are: improvement of young stands by removal of diseased suppressed and overtopping growth; insect and disease control; soil erosion measures; tree planting; construction of roads and trails for fire protection and harvesting; and the building of visitor facilities for recreational use.

The Youth Conservation Corps can make a strong contribution to soil conservation in labor-intensive operations such as tree planting and other revegetation activities, building check dams for gully control, stabilization of stream banks, and in the operation of machinery for the construction of terraces and contours. One of the principal training features on the job will be instruction in the operation of mechanical equipment.

Some of the most urgent jobs on the rangelands that can be performed by the YCC are: weed control and brush removal; land reseeding for increased forage growth; stabilization of gullies with check dams and revegetation; fencing land for controlled grazing; construction of stock-watering facilities.

An example of what subsidized work programs can do for inexperienced and discouraged youth was a project conducted by a New York City settlement house, the Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association. In the words of the project's director:

"The boy's washed walls, plastered and painted stairways. They simonized a station wagon, scraped metal and furniture and painted children's outdoor play equipment. Challenged to show their toughness by climbing tall extension ladders to scrub gymnasium walls, they rose to the challenge and were surprised at the excellent results of their own efforts. . . .

"In a very short period of time the boy's attitudes toward work improved considerably; they were punctual, worked hard and earned the respect of the maintenance staff. Three of the nine boys moved into regular jobs and three returned to school".

The National Social Welfare Assembly pointed out in its 1960 report that camps take youth away from bad influences on city streets and give them socially valuable work experience in an outdoor setting as well as building good work habits.

President Kennedy in a Youth message to the Congress expressed very well why this legislation should be adopted when he said; "If we serve them better now, they will serve their Nation better when the burdens are theirs alone."

In implementing this legislation I would offer the following recommendations:

(1) Many of our young people do not read, write and compute well enough to compete successfully in today's job market. Usually they cannot climb the job ladder without additional schooling and when they lose a job it is difficult to get another. Each year it is harder for youngsters at low levels of literacy to find jobs.

I would therefore hope that any Youth Conservation Corps program include basic education which might be grouped into three parts: (A) Language and communication skills which will aid the Youth Conservation Corps enrollees develop communication skills needed on the job and in his daily relations with his peers and the community; (B) occupational computational skills which will aid the enrollee in developing mathematics skills needed on the job; (C) work orientation and adjustment to help each and every youth Conservation Corps enrollees become aware of what he should be able to do on a job, the requirements of his employers and his fellow workers, and what is expected of him in the world of work.

(2) Counselors must be assigned to each youth conservation camp with the responsibility for the orientation program, which might involve a tour of the training facilities, additional testing to determine the achievement levels and aptitudes of the trainees and personal interviews. The counselor should also assist the Youth Conservation Corps enrollees in finding transportation to and from the Center and might help the enrollees to get the services-medical, and dental etc. to stay in the program.

Effective counselors have varied backgrounds—school, industry, social work, and other agencies. Counselors assigned to a Youth Conservation Camp must be able to relate to trainees and be sensitive to their needs and motivations.

(3) Two weeks training sessions should be mandatory for instructors, administrators, supervisors, and counselors. Major emphasis at these sessions should be on the study of the disadvantaged. Through panel discussions and other approaches participants should study the economics, culture, values, mobility patterns and family relations, education and skill levels of each enrollee.

Many different teaching methods should be employed including: panel discussions, critiques, symposiums, and team teaching. Participants should learn how to identify entry-level skills, develop relationships with employers, unions and employees; make job analyses; plan sequences of instruction, identify teachable materials; and assess the value of tests, including where and when they should not be applied.

(4) A National Advisory Council on Youth Conservation Corps shall be appointed by the Congress with the consent of the President but shall report directly to Members of Congress. This Council shall be composed of prominent specialists in the fields of Education, Sociology, Economics, Social Welfare, Criminology, Forestry, and individuals drawn from the ranks of State, local and federal agencies in areas pertinent to this legislation. At least three members of this Council shall be composed of both minority and majority members of Congress who shall meet a minimum of five times per year to assess the accomplishments under this legislative mandate. This Council shall be requested to prepare prior to July 1st of each fiscal year a detailed report summarizing activities and accomplishments as well as suggesting any improvements necessary in the YCC Program to Members of Congress.

---

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS J. RILLO, PROFESSOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION,  
GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE

The Senate Bill No. 1076 which is designed to create youth conservation camps for troubled youth is indeed one of great merit and consideration. I fully endorse the bill's proposal to give youth some firsthand experiences in the out-of-doors. The urban youth of our country have grown further and further away from direct experience with the land. In doing so, they have become divorced of some of the crucial knowledges and data which are essential for the development of an ecological or an environmental awareness.

It is imperative that our young people understand the conditions in which man's technological aspirations, endeavors and accomplishments have been out of step with the ecological and systematic development of life supportive systems.

In order for youth to develop a set of values with regard to anything they must first have a point of reference from which to depart. Firsthand experiences with the land will of course give young people who might live in the city an opportunity to develop some values with regard to the environment in which they live. Certainly environmental awareness should emanate from where a person spends most of his time. By the same token a contrast should be made between their immediate environment and that environment which they might find a considerable distance away from home in a more rural setting.



Environmental awareness or an ecological consciousness is perhaps one of the greatest contributions education can make to the insurance of a sanative environment. My basic concern for the creation of Conservation Corps Camps is that they will consider two important issues of operative procedure. The first concern that I have deals with the qualified leadership so necessary for the success of any program. The Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's was unique in the fact that the leadership was accessible and readily available. These leaders were also out of work and consequently the guidance and leadership extended to youth was of high caliber.

I hope that the bill will insure that these young people will have the best possible leadership that money can attain. Certainly the project and its goals and objectives is so important that this step must be taken. My second consideration deals with the geographical dissemination of such centers so that they are spaced throughout the United States in order that many areas of the country will benefit from such a project. Even though the far west holds a great deal of grandeur and splendor in terms of dramatic geological and physical terrain and phenomena, there are opportunities in the midwest and on the eastern seaboard for youth to enjoy whatever the geographical location has to give. Conservation is needed everywhere and the youth everywhere need these kinds of experiences if they are to become citizens who are enlightened and who will act judiciously and wisely when it comes to decisionmaking concerning environmental issues. An enraged and an enlightened group of young citizens can accomplish a great deal especially as they begin to interact with the exploitation of our natural, cultural and physical resources because of the profit motive exemplified by some of our more Machiavellian businessmen and technologists.

It is hoped that the Senate bill will also include the provision of qualified advisory professional people who will begin to decide just what projects need to be done and how they can fit into the psychological and physiological capabilities of the youth who are involved in the program. Personally, I think that a program in order to be extremely effective should extend for a longer period of time than just summer months. The two or three summer months do not always insure the kinds of behavioral changes that are so necessary as we begin to develop the ecological awareness vital to the creation of a more habitable environment for tomorrow. These young people will inherit much of the conservation mistakes that have been made by the older generation. They can plan for a better environment and should be concerned and the only way that they can be concerned is that they have some frame of reference, an experiential program which will provide the basis for their participation in either the modification or alleviation of some of the very critical environmental problems of today.

---

#### STATEMENT OF ALBERT L. MASSONI, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

The National Association of Counties represents approximately 3,000 county governments located within the United States and has had a long time interest in programs of youth employment and the development of our natural resources and park and recreation areas. The National Association of Counties strongly endorses the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, feeling that this concept offers assistance for the preservation and development of the Nation's natural resources as well as a program for youth employment.

Summer employment opportunities for the youth of this country in conservation programs on park lands, wildlife refuges, forest lands, streambeds and wilderness areas would provide a rich and rewarding alternative to summers of inactivity, boredom and frustration. What better way is there to conserve the human and natural resources of our Nation than to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. Through a sheer failure to act we are wasting irreplaceable natural resources at an ever increasing rate and, at the same time, there are thousands of young men and women who each summer want to work but cannot find jobs.

Even a preliminary investigation at the local level indicates that an extensive force of workers who can perform hard labor tasks, is urgently needed for the maintenance and development of county park and recreation facilities. The decade of the 1950's brought rapidly accelerating citizen demands for nearby family recreational facilities. In response to this citizen interest, the total number of county parks sharply increased from approximately 900 county parks in 1950 to over 2700 county parks in the early 1960's. During the same decade, the total

county park acreage doubled to 430,707 acres and the "average" county park increased in size to 165 acres.

Citizen participation catapulted from 5,000 volunteers in 1950, to over 45,000 unpaid county recreation leaders in the mid-60's. In addition, 20,263 full-time employees worked on county parks and recreation programs during 1960.

On the ledger side, the expenditures by counties for park and recreation purposes was \$67 million during 1958 and even by 1962 these expenditures had doubled to \$122 million.

These statistics are impressive in telling the story of county government's response to the outdoor recreation challenge, but they do not reflect the tremendous backlog of hard labor jobs which are *not* being performed as the counties strain to provide additional, yet minimal facilities for increasing numbers of interested citizens. By economic necessity, the primary emphasis by the county level of government is upon acquiring nearby recreational lands, before their price becomes prohibitive, and on developing minimum recreational facilities, so that these areas can be used and enjoyed today. Nearly every county park has a wide variety of hard labor jobs which need to be performed, but which are being neglected because of the pressures to acquire and develop useable areas before it is too late.

The statistics are clear. County government and, I dare say, State and Municipal governments could benefit from an expanded version of this bill. Our Association strongly endorses an expanded "partnership" version of this bill that would offer a cooperative approach by the Federal, State, County and Municipal governments in providing employment opportunities through constructive work projects which will develop our natural resources and recreational areas.

Our Association submits for the Committee's consideration, amendments which are enumerated at the end of this statement. Enactment of these suggested amendments would clearly spell out a Congressional intent of encouraging maximum and active participation in the Youth Conservation Corps program by the local levels of government. Thank you.

#### SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO S. 1076 (SUGGESTED LANGUAGE IS ITALICIZED)

##### 1. (Page 1, lines 4-10 and page 2, line 1):

SEC. 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other *Federal, State, County, and City parks, recreational areas and natural resources areas* creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage.

##### 2. (Page 3, beginning line 15):

. . . the Corps in their duties. *The two Secretaries shall have authority to enter into agreements with State and County governments (for purposes of this title "State" shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the natural resources of the Nation, and of developing, managing, and protecting recreational areas, whereby the enrollees of the Corps may be utilized by such governments in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such State or County governments, programs planned and designated by such governments to fulfill such responsibility. Not more than one-third of The Corps shall be available at any one time for utilization by State and County governments, pursuant to such agreements. Any such agreement shall provide that the State or County will defray one-half of all costs incurred with respect to any enrollees utilized by such State or County governments.*

#### STATEMENT OF DR. ELVIS J. STAHR, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY

The National Audubon Society warmly endorses the proposal to establish a Youth Conservation Corps that would supply summer employment opportunities for young men and women at national parks, forests, wildlife refuges and other such areas.

Much could be said on two important aspects of this proposal; the great backlog of conservation work which this summer force could help clear up, and the benefits to our young people that can be found in healthful, constructive out-of-door work.



In these brief remarks, however, the National Audubon Society would like to discuss only a third advantage: The benefits of exposing more young Americans to the natural world. In an era when the large majority of our people live in or near large urban areas—and with the trend moving toward even higher metropolitan concentrations—it becomes increasingly difficult for our youth today to see and understand the natural world they live in. Yet their lives literally depend on the natural world: Depend on the balances between oxygen, water, soil, sunlight, plants, and animals which provide the air we breathe and the food we eat.

Our Society has pioneered in the use of the outdoors in teaching about these vital inter-relationships, and have found the "outdoor laboratory" approach to be a highly successful one. In simplest terms, what we try to teach is this: although science may find it convenient to split natural science studies into fields like biology, meteorology, geology, and zoology, in the actual world all these studies are simply different facets of one all-embracing environment. It is a lesson easy to understand when you can get close to nature and watch the system at work.

If the Youth Conservation Corps can lead to more of this sort of understanding—and we believe it would—then the Corps will be training future Americans who can help lead the way toward wiser use of natural resources.

We need hardly add, in remarks to this committee, that is providing so much leadership in this field, that the need for more widespread understanding of these basic facts of natural life is urgent. So it is for this reason in particular that we urge a prompt and favorable report on S. 1076.

---

STATEMENT OF FRANK C. DANIEL, SECRETARY, NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION  
OF AMERICA

We of the National Rifle Association are pleased to have the opportunity to voice our support for the broad, significant and imaginative program envisioned by S. 1076. The prospect for enlisting the youth of America into the conservation movement is unlimited in potential and in the best tradition of our national purpose.

In the history of our nation our great strength has always been vested in the energies and vision of our youth. To guide this potential for greatness into the field in which many believe rests the future of man's survival on this earth promises to be a major triumph and sounds a note of optimism long needed to cheer on those who battle to save our environment.

We live in a world of constant change and we have been overlong in recognizing that within the sort lifetime of a single generation we have changed from a rural to an urban society. No longer is there a need to conquer the wilderness, if in fact there ever was, the great challenge is to recognize man's place, his effect and his demands on the natural world in order to maintain an environment which will insure his continuance on this earth. It is the youth of the country who must rise to this challenge.

To provide our young people with gainful employment during the summer months when schools are in recess is a worthwhile goal in itself. To provide the custodians of our public domain with a work force when much of the public land is accessible and in a workable condition is likewise a worthwhile goal. By combining these two activities, a third goal of developing in our young people a sense of accomplishment by bettering our environment and an awareness of the natural world in which man lives is established which transcends all others and is a major contribution toward the achievement of producing and preserving a viable environment for all time.

Our association has long sponsored Junior Clubs and has from our very beginnings been concerned with working with youth groups. We now are engaged in expanding our own Junior Club program to provide incentives for our young members to engage in conservation and citizenship activities. We welcome the opportunity to offer our cooperation in this most imaginative and worthwhile proposal and pledge our support for S. 1076, The Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1969.

We respectfully request that this statement be made part of the official record of the proceedings of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during its consideration of S. 1076.

NEW YORK, N.Y., May 8, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It was kind of you to invite me to testify in connection with your bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. Unfortunately, I was unable to be present on April 21, but I am pleased to give you my thoughts on this proposal for inclusion in the record, if you so desire.

I have read with much interest your remarks at the time the bill was introduced.

In my opinion, a Youth Conservation Corps of the type proposed in your bill would perform an extremely valuable service both to the youth of this Nation and also in furthering much needed conservation projects. There may be some confusion between this proposal and the Job Corps, although the two appear to be quite different.

The legislation is very broad in its provisions and the administrative agencies should comment on details.

However, there are some thoughts that do occur to me. For example, the Corps of Engineers is deeply engaged in conservation and recreation projects, and it would seem appropriate to include the Secretary of the Army, along with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, within the provisions of the bill.

My understanding is that the agencies operate under very strict personnel ceilings. My presumption is that the enrollees assigned to the various agencies would be over and above the existing ceilings. This seems fairly clear, but it is not clear that the supervisory employees necessary to run the camps and oversee the work of the enrollees would also be outside the standard personnel ceilings. If this were not so, I think it might be very difficult for the agencies to provide the necessary supervisory personnel, considering the stringencies under which the conservation agencies are now operating.

There is no ceiling as to the number of enrollees, nor indications as to cost of the program. Neither is there indication as to the maximum time period for operating the summer work and education camps. It would seem desirable for the 90-day period to apply to the individual enrollee, with the camps themselves authorized to operate for a somewhat longer period.

One item that may prove of some concern is the age bracket proposed of 14 to 18 years. I believe that most conservation agencies, in employing youth for conservation practices such as forestry cultural measures, tree planting, reseeding, trail building, and emergency firework, normally do not employ youths under 17 or 18 years of age. There could well be difficulties arising from enrolling immature boys of 14 to 15 and assigning them to this type of work. Perhaps it would be a good idea for the first year or two to carry on several pilot programs, and to limit the enrollment to 16 to 18, or else make clear that younger boys would not be required to handle the more arduous physical tasks nor the more dangerous ones.

Your proposal bears some resemblance to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, which accomplished a great deal of valuable conservation work on public lands and was generally accepted throughout the country as a splendid program both in youth rehabilitation and conservation. If your proposal in general would operate in the same way but on a more limited basis, much good would be accomplished. Certainly, there is need to get the conservation work done that has been built up as a backlog on the national parks, forests, recreation areas, and wildlife areas, as well as bordering the Corps of Engineers reservoirs.

Thank you for writing me, and I hope these comments may prove of some assistance.

With kindest personal regards,  
Sincerely,

LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Salem, Oreg., April 16, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: The Youth Conservation Corps Act (S. 1076) offers a needed opportunity for young Americans of high school age to have a better chance to learn work discipline, to mature, and to make themselves useful to society.



This Youth Conservation Corps bill is urgently needed and should have high priority. The aimlessness, the frustrations, and the inactivity imposed on an increasing number of our young people living in urban society can be sharply altered, and these young people can be turned around and given active roles to help improve themselves and the environment in which they live.

My experience with a state youth conservation program gives strong confidence in the concrete benefits that S. 1076 will provide on a national scale. I was a state senator in the Oregon Legislature in 1961 and introduced a Youth Forest Camp Bill which operated for two summers. These boys worked at forest rehabilitation, trail building, stream leaning, assisting with fish propagation, and developing recreation areas. Supervision was under the State Forestry Department. After two summers, the State Forestry Department concluded that the work done by these high school boys exceeded the amount done by adults employed to do the same type of work. This is clear evidence that boys *will* work hard, bear down, and involve themselves constructively if given the opportunity.

The selection of the boys was a difficult problem. Knowing that we would have five applicants for every one that could be hired, I felt that the proper means of determining which boys would most benefit from this summer work experience should be entrusted to the educational system. I therefore charged this responsibility to the county school superintendent. He in turn worked with the high school principals who did the selection on a quota basis according to certain, agreed upon criteria. The basic objective we were after was selecting boys who were showing all the characteristics of becoming dropouts. Careful, statistical tests were conducted by the School Superintendent's office in which a sample of the same types of boys not chosen to work in the summer camp were observed. Of the control group not employed in the work camp, twenty-five out of the fifty failed to complete high school. Of the boys who *did* work at the camp, only two out of fifty failed to complete high school! This is evidence of the kind of motivation and determination that can be built into young people—if provided an opportunity.

The Oregon program lapsed after two years because it depended upon county matching funds and local property taxes, which were unable to support the increasing costs.

I have re-introduced the same type of bill in the Legislature this year with funds provided for five hundred boys. The bill has already passed the Senate Education Committee, but will have a difficult time, I am sure, in getting through the Ways and Means Committee because of a shortage of financing available to state and local governments.

I cannot urge you too strongly to adopt the extremely beneficial concept of the Youth Conservation Corps. Nothing you could do would go further toward instilling the kind of cooperation we need in the young people of America.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. STRAUB,  
*State Treasurer.*

---

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY,  
SCHOOL OF FORESTRY,  
Corvallis, Oreg., April 15, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Thank you for your letter of April 9 describing your interest in a Youth Conservation Corps, Senate Bill 1076, and inviting me to present testimony before your Committee on April 21.

Your bill would provide a basis for significant progress in conservation and sound management on our public forests. It would also have a valuable effect on the high school youth who would be employed.

There is a real need for the conservation work which could be accomplished by these young men. As examples of the useful projects which could be undertaken, young stands could be thinned, stream channels improved, recreational facilities constructed and maintained. Funds and personnel to undertake such activities are at present very restricted relative to the opportunities.

Conservation employment opportunities with the federal agencies begin at age 18, and with some of the state agencies and private industries at 17. Thus, at present, there are few, if any, opportunities for conservation-related employment

of high school youths. Your bill would meet an important need for challenging these young people when they have time available, a potential interest to be stimulated, and energy to be constructively channeled.

My commitments are such that I cannot be in Washington on April 21 to express my personal support for S 1076, but I do hope that the bill will receive favorable action, and would be happy to have this letter presented in my absence.

Sincerely yours,

CARL H. STOLTENBERG, *Dean.*

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,  
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1969.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,*  
*Senate Office Building,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: As the Director of the U.S. Bureau of Biological Survey during the latter years of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and subsequently as the head of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, it was my privilege to see firsthand the amazing results that a properly directed body of men can achieve in aiding the public agencies entrusted with the state and federal conservation programs. Just before the CCC program terminated in 1942, there were more than 40 CCC camps on the national wildlife refuges, which were under my direction and supervision.

These camps were a major help in starting and carrying on the development work needed on the newly acquired refuges. As the CCC camps became available, they were of tremendous help to the program of the Service since its appropriations were limited and we had a very small staff.

In many cases, the newly acquired refuges consisted of little more than posted lands. Whenever we could get a CCC camp, we were immediately able to begin the development needed to make these areas of major value to wildlife. The boys in these camps made firebreaks to protect the wildlife cover, waterholes were constructed to provide reliable water supplies in semi-arid areas, food and cover plantings were established, and impoundments were built. The Corps built patrol roads, fences, picnic grounds and other such needed facilities wherever we were able to secure camps.

At one time before I became Director, it was part of my duties to inspect CCC camps on both national and state forests. I found that they were doing equally satisfactory work in such areas. Many of the facilities available to the public today on national forests, parks, and wildlife areas, as well as the basic developments for maintaining refuges in conditions suitable for wildlife, were the result of the work of the CCC boys.

I am particularly pleased that your bill provides for the administration of the proposed Youth Conservation Corps by the two agencies that have the greatest use for them, namely the Agriculture and Interior Departments. Under the CCC program, the divided authority between the military and the land management agencies regarding the location and management of camps caused friction and lost motion in many cases. I believe the YCC can be handled satisfactorily directly by the Agriculture and Interior Departments.

During the last year, I have had the privilege of visiting several of the Job Corps conservation camps on wildlife refuges. Most of them were doing very good work, and I think the program also was helping the boys. I am very sorry to see that most of the Job Corps Conservation Camps are being discontinued.

Your bill would provide a much better substitute for them, and I certainly hope that it will pass.

Sincerely,

IRA N. GABRIELSON, *President.*



SPORT FISHING INSTITUTE,  
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Sport Fishing Institute wishes to go on record favoring your bill, S. 1076 "to establish in the departments of Interior and Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps, . . ."

We feel very strongly that establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, involving inner city residents in conservation programs, is one of the best means to achieve a solution to one of the most difficult problems facing the municipal authorities today. We all recall the CCC days when youth from the streets were taken into the woods, so to speak, and given a taste of the real out-of-doors and how much this benefitted their way of thinking and way of life. The employment of young men and women in our National parks, Forests, and wildlife and recreation areas for the purpose of performing meaningful conservation duties could achieve much toward reshaping their thinking about what this world is all about. Any time young people come face-to-face with nature in its most secluded and wonderful splendor they begin to think about what a wonderful world they live in. The shabby streets, the garbage and general unsightly litter, the squalor and poverty can be forgotten when one communes with nature.

We wish to go on record in the hearings favoring this legislation to state that this is what we really feel the youth from the inner city needs most today.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. DOUGLAS,  
Executive Secretary.

---

NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1969.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
New Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SCOOP: I apologize for the delay in responding to your letter informing me of your introduction of the Youth Conservation Corps bill, but the intervening time has made it possible for me to take part in discussions that make me certain the forest products industry would be solidly behind the concept.

As you pointed out in your remarks to the Senate, the bill as introduced contains only the bare outline of what the final program would be. But the purposes of the bill certainly would have our support, as well as the means by which we assume those purposes would be achieved.

One of the reasons I am so certain the industry as a whole would be behind this legislation is that a similar question was raised in the hearings last month by the House Banking and Currency Committee. The response there was strong and positive.

The concept, of course, is similar to the old CCC, and I know that you are aware that many of today's foresters got their starts in those camps. Bernie Orell managed a CCC forest camp, for instance, and Bill Hagenstein worked in one at Skyomish. The industry has, in fact, contributed to the support of state programs similar to yours in Washington where boys in these same age groups carry out conservation tasks.

In addition to the social benefits of such a program, the industry would, I am sure, see it as a way to achieve several other benefits. It should serve to expose a lot of people to the possibility of a career in land and resource management. I don't believe enough recruitment is going on for either our professional or non-professional needs.

It is very possible that some of the stand improvement work called for in Senator Sparkman's bill, the National Timber Supply Act (S. 1832), which he introduced last week, could be conducted by young, unskilled workers. The environment in which young people might live and perform this useful work would

be ideal, I believe, for the purposes you have in mind. This is the case in your state where I have observed the work being done by boys in the Conservation Camps on forest stand improvement.

In short, we like what we see in the proposed legislation in its present form and will seek wide industry support and understanding.

Sincerely,

RALPH D. HODGES, Jr.,  
Vice President, Government Relations.

---

SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE,  
Atlanta, Ga., April 18, 1969.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: I was pleased to meet with you and your staff and have the opportunity of discussing your bill for a Youth Conservation Corps (S. 1076).

The Southern Christian Leadership Conference favors this type of legislation. We believe the proposed program can—

- (1) Eliminate some of the boredom, frustration, and inactivity of youths during the summer vacation;
- (2) Provide an open door policy of meaningful summer employment for all youths without regard to race or to social or economic status; not for just the hard core, under privileged, or school dropouts but for all the youths interested in meaningful employment.
- (3) Create in our youth a sense of pride and a greater understanding of our natural resources; and
- (4) Provide much needed improvements in the national parks and forests and on the public lands.

It is our understanding that the YCC would not cause a loss of employment to others engaged in work on the public lands, in that the YCC will be engaged in work which would otherwise not be undertaken.

Therefore, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference believes the proposed YCC offers numerous important benefits and looks forward to prompt enactment of S. 1076.

Sincerely yours,

JIM WRIGHT,  
Washington, D.C., Office Manager.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand adjourned.  
(Whereupon, at 3:45 p.m., the committee was adjourned.)





Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.  
Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.75 per Annum.  
Acceptance for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Post Office Department Circular No. 1110, October 3, 1917.  
Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.  
Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Editor: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Business Manager: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1919, by The American Medical Association  
All rights reserved.  
Printed at the Chicago Press and Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill.

Second-Class Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.  
Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.  
Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.75 per Annum.  
Acceptance for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Post Office Department Circular No. 1110, October 3, 1917.  
Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.  
Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Editor: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Business Manager: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1919, by The American Medical Association  
All rights reserved.  
Printed at the Chicago Press and Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill.

Second-Class Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.  
Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.  
Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.75 per Annum.  
Acceptance for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Post Office Department Circular No. 1110, October 3, 1917.  
Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.  
Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Editor: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Business Manager: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1919, by The American Medical Association  
All rights reserved.  
Printed at the Chicago Press and Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill.

Second-Class Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.  
Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.  
Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.75 per Annum.  
Acceptance for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Post Office Department Circular No. 1110, October 3, 1917.  
Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.  
Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Editor: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Business Manager: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1919, by The American Medical Association  
All rights reserved.  
Printed at the Chicago Press and Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill.

Second-Class Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.  
Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.  
Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1917. Postpaid at Special Rate of \$3.75 per Annum.  
Acceptance for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Post Office Department Circular No. 1110, October 3, 1917.  
Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices.  
Postmaster: Send address changes in advance.

Published by THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Editor: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.  
Business Manager: J. C. LITTLE, M.D., 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1919, by The American Medical Association  
All rights reserved.  
Printed at the Chicago Press and Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill.





# TO ESTABLISH A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

---

PLEASE RETURN TO USDA  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY  
LAW BRANCH, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING  
Rm. 117-E, Admin Bldg.  
Wash. D. C. Ext. 4654

## HEARINGS BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

### H.R. 11145

A BILL TO ESTABLISH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR A  
YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

---

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
OCTOBER 22 AND 23, 1969

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor  
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1969

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon	WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
FRANK THOMPSON, JR., New Jersey	ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania	JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois	ALPHONZO BELL, California
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey	OGDEN R. REID, New York
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana	JOHN N. ERLÉNBOEN, Illinois
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan	WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa
HUGH L. CAREY, New York	JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California	MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan	EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine	WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii	JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York	EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington	ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
PHILLIP BURTON, California	EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania	
LOUIS STOKES, Ohio	
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri	
ADAM C. POWELL, New York	

---

### SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey, *Chairman*

JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan	WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine	ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan	MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington	WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
PHILLIP BURTON, California	JOHN N. ERLÉNBOEN, Illinois
EDITH GREEN, Oregon	EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California	JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania	



# CONTENTS

---

Hearings held in Washington, D.C.:	Page
October 22, 1969-----	1
October 23, 1969-----	43
Text of H.R. 11145-----	1
Statement of—	
Clapper, Louis, on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation-----	43
Dolstad, John, supervisor, Olympic National Park, Wash-----	48
Frome, Michael, conservation editor, Field & Stream magazine-----	94
Jackson, Hon. Henry M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Wash- ington-----	4
Swanson, Raymond, director, Western Forest Industries Association--	64
Tupling, Lloyd, Washington representative of the Sierra Club-----	101
Weber, Hon. Arnold, Assistant Secretary for Manpower, Department of Labor, accompanied by: William H. Kolberg, Associate Man- power Administrator of Policy, Evaluation, and Research, Man- power Administration-----	22
Wyatt, Hon. Wendell, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon-----	21
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.:	
Clapper, Louis, on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation, “Straight Talk,” article in National Wildlife magazine, April-May 1968 issue-----	47
Edwards, Dr. Alfred L., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Rural De- velopment and Conservation, U.S. Department of Agriculture, statement of-----	42
Frome, Michael, conservation editor, Field & Stream magazine, testimony of-----	94
Glasgow, Dr. Leslie, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, De- partment of the Interior:	
Letter to Chairman Perkins dated October 27, 1969-----	108
Statement of-----	41
Hanna, Hon. Richard T., a Representative in Congress from the State of California, comments on the Conservation Corps and H.R. 14260-----	106
Jackson, Hon. Henry M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Wash- ington, estimated per enrollee costs for a 90-day summer Youth Conservation Corps program (table)-----	20
Meeds, Hon. Lloyd, a Representative in Congress from the State of Washington:	
“Man—The Most Endangered Species,” article in the New York Times-----	100
Statement of-----	2
National Association of Counties, statement on behalf of-----	109
Swanson, Raymond, director, Western Forest Industries Association:	
A report on the summer camp program-----	86
Report of a program in 1964-----	68
Tupling, Lloyd, Washington representative of the Sierra Club:	
Statement of the Sierra Club-----	101
“Trip No. 103,” article in Sierra Club Bulletin, September 1969--	104
Wright, Robert E., executive director, Mayor’s Council on Youth Opportunity, Jersey City, N.J., letter to Chairman Daniels, dated September 4, 1969-----	109





# TO ESTABLISH A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

---

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1969

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:45 a.m., pursuant to notice, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dominick V. Daniels (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Daniels, Meeds, Green, Hawkins, Scherle, Esch, Erlenborn, and Collins.

Staff members present: Daniel H. Krivit, counsel; Sue Nelson, research assistant; Cathy Romano, secretary; and Michael J. Bernstein, minority counsel for education and labor.

(Text of H.R. 11145 follows:)

[H.R. 11145, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To establish in the Department of Labor a Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth, under the Department of Labor in conjunction with its Federal manpower and job training programs for youth, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas creates an opportunity for understanding, and an appreciation of, the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth upon whom will fall the responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources.

## YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out authorized programs with respect to the employment of youth in the land and water areas referred to in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of Labor a Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of Labor may employ without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of providing gainful employment, generating understanding, developing, preserving, or maintaining lands, and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the United States. Members of the Corps shall be appointed without regard to geographical location or economic status.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall consult with the Secretaries of the Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture concerning the areas appropriate for carrying out programs using employees of the Corps. The rates and

hours and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall be as determined by the Secretary of Labor in consultation with the other above-named Secretaries: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (28 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.), and the Act of September 6, 1966 (5 U.S.C. 8102 et seq.): *And provided further*, That no member of the Corps may be employed for a term in excess of ninety consecutive days during any one calendar year.

(c) The Secretary of Labor may provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the Corps in their duties.

(d) The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Labor such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. DANIELS. The Select Subcommittee on Labor will come to order.

The purpose of today's hearings is to receive testimony concerning H.R. 11145 and related bills. The principal bill to be considered is sponsored by our distinguished colleague, Lloyd Meeds of Washington. His bill would establish a Youth Conservation Corps in the Department of Labor.

Over a year ago, the President's Commission on Civil Disorders reported that the lack of substantial employment opportunities for youth was a principal cause of civil disorders. To try to ameliorate this problem, the Commission recommended expansion of innovative training and employment programs for young people.

It is the intent of this bill to establish a corps of young men and women, ages 14 through 18, employed by the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain the natural resources of the United States. Each corps member would be employed for a period not to exceed 90 days and would participate in summer work and educational projects in our national parks, forests, national wildlife refuges, and other public lands.

Members of the corps would be appointed without regard to geographical location or economic status.

H.R. 11145 is similar in many respects to S. 1076, already passed this year in the Senate. The Senate measure was sponsored by Senator Jackson and 26 of his colleagues on a bipartisan basis.

There seems little doubt as to the need for more programs for our youth in the outdoors. There also seems to be an overwhelming need to conserve our natural resources. Enactment of H.R. 11145 would be a fine way to achieve these two basic goals to which this legislation is devoted.

Our first witness this morning is the Honorable Henry Jackson, U.S. Senator from the State of Washington.

I shall call upon my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington, Lloyd Meeds, to introduce the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I first ask unanimous consent that my statement be inserted at this point in the record. I will not read it.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. LLOYD MEEDS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE  
STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. Chairman, the last several years have seen the Nation in turmoil, with racial and student problems a part of our plague. A great deal of our mind and



energy has been devoted to finding solutions which strike at the root of these pressing problems.

This hearing today, on the bills to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, marks the beginning of what hopefully will be part of the solution to our problems.

We find large numbers of young people idle during the summers. Last June a total of 1,436,000 were without jobs. This represents 14% of our young men and 20.7% of our young women who desire work. The tragedy of it is that these young people are not wanting a summer of relaxation. Rather, they are actively seeking work, but coming away empty handed.

Especially in our urban areas, too many young Americans never have an opportunity to gain the experience useful work brings. Consequently, their summer months are marked by frustration, idleness, and boredom—their energy is often spent in pursuit of undesirable goals.

As I see the bill, it presents an opportunity for youngsters of differing socioeconomic-ethnic backgrounds to (1) work together in the out-of-doors, (2) experience what it means to "earn" a salary, (3) aid in the preservation and wise utilization of our national resources and (4) gain an appreciation and regard for our great natural resources, with an accompanying awareness of responsibility. All this would be an alternative to standing on the corner for the summer.

Administration representatives are usually quick to state that while they favor the aims of this proposal, these aims can be accomplished through existing programs. But they do not mention a number of facts. They do not mention that the conservation accomplished through existing programs is of the picking-up-paper-in-the-park type, rather than meaningful forest conservation. They do not mention that while existing youth programs involve federal aid, this federal aid is on an ad hoc state or local, program-by-program basis. There is no national purpose or national focus. They do not mention the 1,436,000 summer unemployed young people—the kind of people at which this bill is aimed.

I think it important to point out that while this government has manpower programs for nearly every segment of society, our young people ages 14 to 18 have been left out, by and large. Such manpower programs are usually designed to put people in the labor force. Under this bill labor is a vehicle for appreciation of our natural resources and education—these young people would learn of themselves, of their relationships with others, of our natural resources and of the satisfaction of a job well done.

As I see it we cannot afford to bypass this opportunity to help lock out the ills of prejudice and misunderstanding, and at the same time conserve our great natural resources.

MR. MEEDS. I take great pleasure in introducing to the committee my mentor and very close friend, Senator Jackson, who was a Member of this body for 12 years, who has been in the Senate quite some time, who is chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, and who is prime sponsor of S. 1076, joined by 24 bipartisan cosponsors in the Senate, the legislation which we are considering, in addition to H.R. 11145.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the witness before us is Mr. Conservation in the United States. In his years as chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, he has been responsible for the passage of much of the conservation and recreation legislation which we have today; prime sponsor and mover of such things as the Cascades National Park, the National Trails bill, National Scenic Rivers, Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Redwoods National Park, and I could go on and on.

But I think it is sufficient to say that he is the recipient in 1969 of the John Muir Award for Conservation, the most coveted conservation award.

I have the great distinction and pleasure of serving in the congressional district which Senator Jackson used to represent. He is not only a close personal friend, but is a very valued ally.

Senator Jackson?

**STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY M. JACKSON, U.S. SENATOR FROM  
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**

Senator JACKSON. Thank you, Congressman Meeds.

Mr. DANIELS. Before you proceed, I want to second my colleague, that I am indeed familiar with your fine record. You are highly regarded and held in great esteem, not only by the Members of your body, but also by many of my friends in the House.

Senator JACKSON. Thank you, first, Congressman Meeds, for your generous remarks and, Mr. Chairman, for your very kind comments.

It is a real pleasure for me to have this opportunity to testify before this distinguished House Select Subcommittee on Labor in support of H.R. 11145 introduced by Congressman Meeds and Congressman Wyatt, and also on S. 1076, which passed the Senate, on June 26. These important measures would establish a nationwide Youth Conservation Corps program for young men and women between 14 and 18 years of age who would participate in supervised summer work and educational projects.

Both measures have as their major purpose the development of the Nation's greatest asset—our youth. A second purpose relates to improving the management and administration of our Nation's great publicly owned resources—our national parks, wildlife refuges and national forests.

The Youth Conservation Corps program, as set forth in S. 1076, would not be limited to just the underprivileged and school dropouts. Rather, it would be a blend of young men and women from all walks of life, a blend that reflects the economic and racial composition of our Nation. By working toward the common goal of developing and maintaining the natural resources of our national forests, parks, and recreation areas, enrollees in the program would not only improve these resources for all Americans, but would also have an opportunity to share their experiences.

Mr. Chairman, knowledge and understanding are essential to the development of responsibility. It is my judgment that exposure to and participation in public service conservation projects can be a maturing, stabilizing, and educational experience for the young people of this country. Establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps would, I believe, return to the Nation individual and public benefits that are incapable of being assessed.

As you are aware, S. 1076, as passed by the Senate, calls for the initiation of a 3-year pilot program. An initial pilot program was chosen to minimize program costs and to provide data for an annual program analysis report to determine if the Corps is fulfilling the intended purpose of the act. Before the life of the program would be extended, or its size increased, it would be reviewed, and new legislative authority would be required.

At a time when there is great national concern for the maintenance of our natural environment and for meeting expanding demands for outdoor recreation, measures need to be taken to intensify resource management programs. If the future leaders of our Nation are to be expected to understand that the great out-of-doors has a relevant role in their lives, they must experience the sense of accomplishment in completing a difficult task, of understanding the importance of land



and water conservation and management, and of working in programs to assure that future generations of Americans will enjoy life in a quality environment.

The enrollees in the Youth Conservation Corps would be employed in a variety of conservation duties. They would help to reduce the tremendous backlog of maintenance and development work in park and recreation areas. The Corps members could perform projects involving timberland improvement, trail maintenance, wildlife habitat improvement, basic soil and water conservation duties, and maintenance and construction of campground facilities.

Time would also be devoted to teaching these young men and women the basic concepts of ecology, fish and game management, forest and range management, and other principles which would give them a greater appreciation and understanding of our Nation's natural resources and the necessity for preserving and maintaining this great national heritage.

It is my belief that the Federal Government is not fulfilling its responsibility in educating and training our youth in natural resource management. This fact was made abundantly clear when I was informed by a Department of Labor representative during the hearings on S. 1076 that of the 364,000 youth enrolled in the 1968 Neighborhood Youth Corps program, only 600 conducted conservation work in connection with the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

There is a need to recognize the importance of training young men and women in the field of natural resources management and general conservation work. The manpower need in our forests, parks, and other recreation areas is critical. As a result of the burgeoning demands for all types of outdoor recreation by Americans, we are already unable to adequately finance and maintain these areas and yet, I am told by the National Park Service that visitations will double between 1968 and the early 1970's and perhaps multiply to nearly 10 times their present volume by the year 2000.

Mr. Chairman, following Senate passage of S. 1076, I made a point of visiting a private youth conservation camp in the Olympic National Park in my State. This program which is operated by the Student Conservation Association is, in many respects, a prototype of what is proposed in the legislation before the committee today.

Having seen firsthand the important and productive work these young people accomplished, and having talked to many of them, I came away convinced that Federal investment in a Youth Conservation Corps program is an investment we should and must make. It is an investment in the future—the future of the country and tomorrow's leaders.

The student conservation program in the Olympic National Park has never had a dropout in its 12 years of operation. The young people involved in the program have always arrived on time, stayed the full period, and usually leave wanting a longer program.

The intense interest of the youngsters in this type of a work and educational experience was displayed in a letter I recently received from one of them. This young man stated that as a result of his work last summer, he has now decided to seek an education in natural resource management, with the ultimate goal of working in this rewarding field.

Mr. Jack Dolstad of the Student Conservation Association will be here tomorrow and will, I believe, also be testifying in support of the legislation before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee's early and favorable action to establish a Youth Conservation Corps program.

I wish to thank the chairman and members of the subcommittee for this opportunity to testify here today and to give you my judgment of this important program.

Mr. DANIELS. Senator, on behalf of myself and the other members of the subcommittee I want to thank you for a very fine comprehensive statement in support of the legislation pending before the subcommittee.

Senator, I have noted your remark on page 4 of your statement that of 364,000 youth enrolled in 1968 in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, only 600 conducted conservation work in connection with the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

Do you have any statistics relative to the number of young boys and girls who are enrolled in the Job Corps?

Senator JACKSON. I don't have those figures, although I am certain the Department will be able to supply this information.

I did want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the present program of the Neighborhood Youth Corps is not oriented toward the area of conservation which I feel is an essential part of making it possible for these youngsters to become better citizens. I think it is important that they be taken off the streets of our major urban areas and be given employment in the great out-of-doors.

I think it is fine to take care of some of them locally, but I also feel that there is this tremendous need in our national forests, national parks, wilderness, and wildlife refuge areas.

Mr. DANIELS. The Chairman fully respects your views on that subject. Because my memory goes back to the late 1930's during the days of the depression when we had the CCC's. I do know many young men from my home community who took advantage of that program and joined the CCC's which was not only helpful in giving them needed skills, but also in developing their bodies and minds. I know men who are today leading citizens of our community and without the aid of the program, I doubt very much if they could have achieved this degree of success.

I think the program is a splendid program. However, I want to get down to some nuts and bolts issues.

What was the attitude of the administration witnesses in connection with the hearing conducted before the Senate body?

Senator JACKSON. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior supported the objectives of this bill as Departments, but an adverse report was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

I want to emphasize something very important here: under the bill as it passed the Senate, we do not limit the program to the disadvantaged youth. This is a central point in this whole legislative program, as I see it.

If the disadvantaged youth is to be helped, based on what I have seen thus far, it is apparent to me that it cannot be accomplished if only disadvantaged youth are represented in camps.

I think that the disadvantaged youth can learn from those who come from backgrounds of better circumstances, and the youngsters



from better circumstances can learn from the youngsters who come from poverty backgrounds.

Mr. Chairman, it is this mix that goes to the heart of the program. I think where we have had trouble, and particularly in connection with the Job Corps, stems in large measure from the fact that disadvantaged youngsters are comingling only with disadvantaged youngsters. They see nothing but despair and hopelessness in that kind of environment. It is a pretty grim future.

I must say that the witnesses we had before the Senate Interior Committee—and Mr. Dolstad who will testify before your committee tomorrow was one of them—made a big point on this particular aspect of the program. It was their experience that much greater progress can be made in helping the poor and the disadvantaged with the kind of mixture that is provided for in this bill.

Mr. DANIELS. With regard to this question of mixture that you advocate, would your Youth Conservation Corps involve youths from the rural as well as our urban centers?

Senator JACKSON. We have in the bill, as passed by the Senate, a priority preference for the disadvantaged youth. They can come from the rural areas as well as the cities. However, I think it is quite clear that in the administration of the program primary emphasis should be placed on those who come from the large urban areas.

We want to get the youngsters into open spaces. The youngsters from the rural areas have already that advantage.

Mr. DANIELS. Would you disqualify them?

Senator JACKSON. No; I certainly wouldn't disqualify them. I think it would be a mistake to, because we have tremendous poverty in the rural areas.

Mr. DANIELS. Do you believe that this legislation should have a provision for evaluative research as an integral part of the Youth Conservation Corps?

Senator JACKSON. Yes; I think research here is a very important part of this program. One of the things that I would see in connection with the program would be an opportunity for the youngsters to learn something about ecology and about the specific disciplines involved, such as forestry, botany, and so on.

In addition to the work that they would be doing during the summer months, which is so similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps, to which you so effectively referred, they would have the chance to receive instruction as it pertains to a better understanding of the environment that we live in and the things that must be done to conserve our total environment.

Mr. DANIELS. There is a distinction between the bill that you have sponsored in your body and the two bills that we have before us today, H.R. 11145 and H.R. 14260. I believe the bills sponsored by my colleagues in the House provide for the Youth Conservation Corps to be established in the Department of Labor, whereas, your bill involves the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

Do you have any fixed or strong feelings as to which Department should exercise jurisdiction over the proposed Youth Corps?

Senator JACKSON. I think we can work that out, Mr. Chairman. As I see it, the direct administration of the program should be undertaken by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. They are familiar with the type of work which must be done, and have an under-

standing of the qualifications necessary for that type of employment.

I think the Department of Labor might possibly act as a coordinating agency, while leaving the definitive details of the work to the Departments that will be supervising and directing the youngsters.

Mr. DANIELS. One last question with reference to funding: I believe the Senate bill that you sponsored contains a specific authorization, whereas, the House sponsored bills are open-ended.

What is your estimate as to the cost of sponsoring a program or what would you recommend with regard thereto?

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, we started out with an open-ended approach to this program, insofar as the appropriation authority was concerned. However, we reduced the bill to a 3-year pilot program, after which we would have to come back for an extension or for a follow-on program.

We limited the authorization to an appropriation of \$3½ million annually. This would take care of about 3,000 youngsters, for a 90-day period. This was the estimate that we had received from the Departments concerned.

Therefore, the \$3½ million limitation is directly related to the modified bill as a pilot program.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you. I have no further questions. I shall now call upon my distinguished colleague from the State of Iowa, Mr. Scherle.

Mr. SCHERLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning to you, Senator Jackson. Your reputation as a conservationist and one who is vitally interested in our natural resources is certainly well known to everyone, both in and out of the field.

I don't think there is anyone who could have a deeper sympathy for the youth of America than I do. I have two young sons of my own. However, I must reserve my judgment as far as this legislation is concerned. I fear a general overlap in many of our areas that already exist.

You made mention a moment ago that the Neighborhood Youth Corps was not necessarily set up to be a program dealing in conservation. It was oriented more or less for those in the ghetto areas.

Yet the Job Corps, if my memory serves me correctly, had a specific number of camps, for individuals that would have to be in this category.

The other thing that concerns me very much is the age limit, 14 to 18. My young son, Bill, had the privilege of working out in your fabulous State last year, in Olympia National Park. The restrictions at that time were that you be 18 or more. The reason it was 18 is because there is work that no one under that age could do very well.

He was pretty good size and did his job well. I wonder what a 14-year-old would be able to do at that stage of the game.

I am just making statements now, Senator.

The other thing that concerns me is a 3-year pilot program. After going through the outlandish misdirections of some of the OEO's pilot programs, it certainly made my gun shy. A 3-year pilot program, I don't think, would serve much.

The one part of your statement that interested me very much was on page 4, where you said following Senate passage of your bill, you visited a private youth conservation camp.



By private, do you mean that this was self-endowed, there was no appropriation? Was it run by the State? I think this is the secret of what you are trying to do right there.

Senator JACKSON. The Student Conservation Association is a private conservation organization which has its headquarters in New York State. They take approximately 150 youngsters each year from throughout the United States, and make it possible for them to work without pay, in the parks during the summer months. They have an agreement with the National Park Service to do that job.

I would point out that the mix there is not the same as what I would envisage in this legislation. But when Mr. Dolstad—the gentleman I referred to earlier—testifies, he can indicate the particulars of the program based on his long experience with this organization. I appreciate your generous remarks, Congressman and I do want to emphasize that a 14-year-old can really do a lot of good, hard, productive work in a national park or in a national forest.

I grew up in the Cascades. At age 10 I started going into the mountains as a Cub Scout and later as a Boy Scout.

The one reason that I have emphasized the 14- to 18-year-old age group is that when we pick up a newspaper or watch TV or listen to radio, it is evident that most of the trouble in our major metropolitan areas and elsewhere stem from the youngsters in the 14 to 18 age classification.

Mr. SCHERLE. If I may interrupt there, this is true. It saddens me a great deal because we have really defeated ourselves in this proposal because some of the restrictions placed by labor as far as the minimum wage is concerned, some of the restrictions placed on young men particularly in rural areas that can't drive a tractor, is almost as facetious as mandatory retirement at 65 and spending billions of dollars trying to find things for our elderly people to do.

Sometimes I think we are defeating our purpose. We realize what the problem is. This statement made by my esteemed chairman that over a year ago, the President's Commission on Civil Disorders reported that the lack of substantial employment opportunities for youth was a principal cause of civil disorders.

I agree with this. But there are so many restrictions placed on our youth that we confine them to unemployment until they reach the age of 18. I think this is a great handicap as far as our youth is concerned today.

Senator JACKSON. Congressman, I would like to make two comments: No. 1, we found, for example, in the city of Seattle, where we have a fair-size minority population, that over half of the youngsters in that area had never visited our large city park, known as Woodland Park. I think the reason for this stems from the fact that many of these youngsters come from broken homes. The father is not there to take them on a weekend camping trip. We found further that an incredible percentage of the disadvantaged youth have not even been in the national forests in close proximity to Seattle. I imagine that Mrs. Green has a similar situation in Portland.

The Snoqualmie National Forest is only 40 minutes away from downtown Seattle. The Olympic National Park is an hour and a half away. Mount Rainier National Park is only 2 hours away; and the North Cascades is an hour and a half away. These great outdoor areas are

nearby and yet these youngsters have not had an opportunity to get inside any of these areas. I believe that the major reason for this stems from youth being raised in broken homes, without a father to take a real interest in the boy.

This is yet another reason why I feel it is important to take these youngsters off the streets during the summer and give them a chance to work.

With reference to the child labor laws, I think we have reached the point where certainly those laws ought to be reviewed in light of present conditions. We know that that legislation stemmed from the era of the "sweat shop" and prohibitions against employment below 18, without exception, makes no sense.

I worked in the sawmills in my hometown at the age of 16, doing hard manual labor. It didn't hurt me. It was the finest thing that ever happened to me during the summer months.

So, I wouldn't disagree about the need to review the legislation insofar as it pertains to the obvious changes that have taken place during the past many years.

Mr. SCHERLE. I would add two suggestions before I yield to my colleague from Washington. One is that, if these disadvantaged youth in Seattle, in New York, in Council Bluffs, in Des Moines, Iowa—this would be a wonderful project for the people of that community to undertake themselves and see to it that their citizens, those disadvantaged and unfortunate children, go to that park.

I think there is enough heart in Seattle, Council Bluffs, and other places that this should be done.

Second, I would like to see, since this is a pilot program, the State legislatures innovate and work on that. I think this belongs to the State level rather than implement it on the Federal level at this time.

Senator JACKSON. I just want to say, Congressman, that as chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, we have been authorizing a lot of park legislation. I can tell you very candidly the major problem that we face in connection with our national park and national forest programs, pertains to the administration of those specific projects.

We are way, way behind in maintaining trails, and just in doing the minor things that are necessary to keep existing programs in condition.

I want to emphasize that the Youth Conservation Corps legislation in question does pertain to a Federal responsibility. It is a responsibility of the Federal Government, not of the States, to see to it that our great natural resources, including our national parks, forests, lake-shores, seashores, recreation areas, and wilderness areas, are properly maintained.

I feel very strongly about the Federal responsibility there. These youngsters would be used to aid in that effort.

Mr. SCHERLE. Isn't there a program now under the National Park Service where they hire these 18-year-old youths to work during the summer months all over the United States on all national parks, cutting trails and building fences?

Senator JACKSON. This is a very, very limited program, as I am sure your son would indicate. They are tremendously understaffed. They employ college students 18 and over during the summer months. But they are woefully understaffed in regard to the numbers that they need to do the job of maintenance and operation.



Mr. SCHERLE. The thing that concerns me here is that you have supervisory personnel there now who now oversee and tell these youngsters what to do and how to do it, particularly 18-year-olds. If you would implement a camp of that type from 14 to 18, you would spend much more money, time and effort in a supervisory capacity of following them around. I wonder if the effect would justify the project cost?

I thank you, Senator.

Mr. DANIELS. The gentleman from the State of Washington, Mr. Meeds.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to pursue a couple of the points raised by my colleague from Iowa. First of all, Senator, both these bills, the Senate bill and the House bill, were introduced early. After your hearings, it was written into the Senate bill that—incidentally, something with which I agree—that this would be a 3-year pilot program.

Would you agree with me that perhaps one of the major problems we had with Job Corps was that we didn't have a pilot program with Job Corps, that we just jumped into it and didn't do the research and didn't have the benefit of the trial-and-error experience which would come about with a pilot program?

Senator JACKSON. I couldn't agree with you more. It was the unanimous judgment of the Senate Interior Committee that we should proceed on a pilot basis.

I want to emphasize that the committee did report the bill unanimously and it passed the Senate without objection.

Mr. MEEDS. The information which would be gathered from a 3-year pilot program would not only be useful in the Federal programs which, as you point out, are absolutely the responsibility of the Federal Government, the national parks, national seashores, wilderness areas, but the results could also be used for the types of programs that Mr. Scherle is talking about by State and local groups who wish to do the same type of conservation management on their own properties.

Senator JACKSON. Yes. I would point out, Congressman Meeds, that the State of Washington does have a program for youngsters of this kind at the present time. Under State law, the Department of Natural Resources, the agency responsible for managing our State-owned school lands which contain tremendous stands of timber, is permitted to hire youngsters under age of 18 during the summer months.

Mr. Burt Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands in the State of Washington, testified before our committee explaining how effective his program had been in the State of Washington.

I just cite that as an illustration of what our State is trying to do in this regard and other States, I believe, have undertaken similar moves.

Mr. MEEDS. With regard to the age 14, I certainly appreciate what you said about your own background. I have the distinct feeling that in the United States today, one of the problems, one of the great problems, with the restlessness of our youth is that we are not tapping that energy. There is no more wood to haul in. There are no more ashes to take out. The boy in the house mows the lawn and that is about the extent of his responsibility.

Would you agree with me that in a program like this at age 14, 15 through 18, young people are going to have some responsibility for

useful production, which will benefit not only them, but the rest of our society? This is meaningful work.

Senator JACKSON. I couldn't agree more.

I would add that a youngster who has had the exposure to the out of doors, to the great forests, to see the wildlife, is going to be a better youngster in the long run. He is going to be kind if he knows anything about nature. If he understands wildlife, he will grow up with an attitude of respect insofar as his environment is concerned.

A youngster who has had the exposure that a lot of Boy Scouts get in connection with their camping trips is an understanding youngster. Although a program carried on in the large urban areas, right in the same environment to which the youngsters are exposed all the time makes it possible, of course, to keep them busy and occupied, but it does not offer the type of understanding that I have just mentioned. Working in the out of doors and knowing about our great forests, and nature as a whole, is an added dividend that you can't find in the large urban areas. This is a part of character building, this is a part of the whole thrust of the program that we have in mind in connection with this legislation.

Mr. MEEDS. Senator, there was some reference by the gentleman from Iowa about duplication of present programs. Would you agree with me that there is no program today at the Federal level which exactly fits what we are trying to do here?

They are either programs for rather intensive job training or education, or conservation, or they are programs which do not take the young people out of the environment they are in, but pay them a wage for doing something around the city, or they are programs which are simply educational. We are trying to get a mix with this bill, not only of people, but of functions: education, conservation, and a number of other things. There is not a single program in effect today that does this, isn't this true?

Senator JACKSON. You are absolutely correct. I point out that the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, and the Park Service in the Department of Interior, have the expertise to bring these youngsters into their programs and train them. They have the trained naturalists in the parks and in the forests to give them the kind of lectures, training, and exposure that would be a part of this effort.

There is no duplication between the bill under question and existing legislation. The Park Service and the Forest Service are now unable, by reason of existing law, to hire youngsters under the age of 18.

What you do here is that you follow right on through in connection with existing programs by lowering the statutory hiring level to age 14, and you will provide some added training programs, educational programs, to help do something for these youngsters 14 to 18 who are the source of most of our violence during the summer months in our cities. The 14- to 18-year-old group is the largest single contributor to difficulties in our major urban areas.

So, we are trying to zero in on that specific problem. That is why these specific additional programs that I have referred to, such as orientation, conservation, and training would be an added benefit.

Mr. MEEDS. Again, on the question of the need for this type of thing, let me cite examples with which you and I are particularly familiar.

Washington State is one of the Nation's leaders in providing State



outdoor recreation, and local county outdoor recreation facilities, and the Federal Government is also very active in our State.

But, as I am sure you are aware, if you take your trailer or your camper or your tent in Washington State today and attempt to find a place, which had been improved somewhat, you are going to be almost unable to do so unless you leave at 3:30 Tuesday morning. Wouldn't the providing of campgrounds with tables, fireplaces, with easy access to people with campers and trailers and tents, wouldn't these be some of the things that you envision in the contents of this bill?

Senator JACKSON. Certainly the opportunity exists here to expand our space effort. I use that word in its broadest sense to include such examples that you have mentioned.

You see, Congressman Meeds, I think that in trying to resolve the problems of our major urban areas and the violence there, one can't help but come to the conclusion that there is a direct relationship between congestion on one hand and violence on the other.

This is the greatest problem that we face in America today. In 1790, when we took our first census, 1 year after the founding of the Republic, 95 percent of our people—this is an interesting figure—lived in the rural areas.

Today, 70 percent of our people live on 1 percent of the land. In other words, 30 percent of our people live on 99 percent of the land.

There is this tremendous need for additional open space. The youngsters who grow up in the major urban areas, where open spaces are not available, and where there is an absence of strong family ties, frequently get into trouble.

This legislation is designed to make it possible, at least during the summer months, to introduce youngsters to the out of doors. I submit to you that if we start them down this road they will get in the habit at an older age of wanting to go out on camping trips and they will be interested in the out of doors.

You don't get the violence in our great open spaces that you get in our great congested areas.

Mr. MEEDS. In the final analysis, these are the people that will inherit the responsibility for the management, as well as the benefit of our outdoors.

Thank you, Senator.

Mr. DANIELS. The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Esch. Do you have any questions?

Mr. ESCH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join my colleagues, Senator, in welcoming you to our committee, and indicate what an honor it is to have one with the background and experience and leadership that you have had in the area of conservation in this country.

I have two or three questions directly related to the bill and perhaps in larger nature related to the scope of the problem.

I have noticed the difference between Senate bill 1076 and my colleague's H.R. 11145, in that the Senate bill as passed gave the Corps to the Interior Department in cooperation with the Agriculture Department. Is that correct?

Senator JACKSON. This is correct. This was done because I feel that the natural resource agencies—namely, the Departments of Interior and Agriculture—have the expertise to supervise youth in resource

management programs. They understand what needs to be done, and how most effectively to accomplish their desired goals.

Mr. Esch. I appreciate that very much, because I am concerned about the jurisdiction of the bill and the intent of the bill. It appears to me that as one who has written to both Interior, Agriculture, and Labor asking them to develop such a concept within the last year—a group on this side of the aisle did—it seemed to us that the real thrust of the measure should well be moved in the Interior and Agriculture Departments rather than the Labor Department as such.

Senator JACKSON. I agree with you.

Mr. Esch. Would you concede that probably the real intent is not to develop a manpower training bill as such? This isn't intended to be a mandatory manpower training bill. Obviously in 90 days you can't train anyone.

Senator JACKSON. No, sir; it is not a training bill as such, although there are some educational benefits that obviously can accrue from a well-administered program during the 90-day employment period.

But it is more of a catalyst in that regard than an ongoing program such as the Job Corps.

Mr. Esch. And the major objective would be, first, to create a more favorable environment for youngsters for a period of summer employment; and, second, to aid in the development and maintenance of our park system.

Senator JACKSON. Yes, I think they are of equal importance. Which one comes first would depend on an evaluation at the end of the 3-year pilot period. I think these youngsters can make a significant contribution to the operation and maintenance of our natural resource programs in the allotted 90-day summer program.

Mr. Esch. How many people do we have in part-time summer employment in our park system now in a comparable category over age 18? Do you know?

Senator JACKSON. I don't have that information. But I am sure Mr. Hartzog, Director of the Park Service, could give you that.

Mr. Esch. I believe he is coming up later.

Senator JACKSON. Yes, I am sure he can give you the breakdown. I know that they are woefully short.

Mr. Esch. Do you know the scope of any such programs at a State level within State systems? Are there States that have Youth Corps active today?

Senator JACKSON. Yes, sir. By State law, the Department of Natural Resources in the State of Washington permits the employment of youngsters under the age of 18 in connection with the management of their grazing lands and their forest lands. This program has worked very well.

Mr. Esch. Would you see any objection in the development of the House bill of working cooperatively with State departments of natural resources to provide cooperative programs in such Youth Corps?

I am aware that there are many State park systems that surely could benefit cooperatively in a program.

Senator JACKSON. Congressman, this point was raised by some of the Senators in connection with our hearing on S. 1076. I think there is a lot of merit in this approach.



It does, however, get down to the matter of priorities. Speaking of a pilot program, involving only, 3,000 youngsters per year, one can only scratch the surface of our Federal needs. If the program is enlarged later by the Congress, then I think we could give consideration to the possibility of providing this kind of assistance to appropriate State agencies or subdivisions of States.

There will be a great need for instance to aid cities in connection with our open space education programs, city parks and so on.

My staff assistant was kind enough to provide me with some material in response to the question that you raised about what the States are doing in youth conservation. I would like to read this brief comment of Mr. Burt Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands, which he presented before the Senate Interior Committee earlier this year in connection with S. 1076.

The Washington State Department of Natural Resources has been interested in summer employment of young people for many years. We participate in whatever federal programs are available and in addition employ in excess of 350 young people each summer in our state-financed programs. We receive many applications for each available job and generally employ the most qualified candidates.

However, we do not respond to requests from local courts and police authority for a limited number of positions in which to place selected problem youths.

I thought you would be interested in that.

Mr. ESCH. Two other questions: Senator, do you have any idea about how many individuals we could place just within the Federal park system in such a program? Let us say that after the pilot program, do you have any identification of how broad a scope we could cover in terms of numbers of young people that we could place in our park system now and absorb in the present system?

Senator JACKSON. During the summer months, for the 90-day period only, it would run into the tens of thousands. The national forests also face a very serious problem in connection with their maintenance programs. There again, it would run into the tens of thousands. I would have to, in the last analysis, ask the respective heads of the Forest Service and the Park Service for a more definitive estimate.

Mr. ESCH. I appreciate your comments. I am concerned about two aspects. One, to attempt to define from the standpoint of conservation needs and also from the standpoint of young people in the country how broad the problem is; second, I think we should bear in mind that it is not a manpower training program, per se, and that the jurisdiction might well fall into the Interior Committee rather than the Education and Labor Committee.

Senator JACKSON. Might I make one concluding comment. I appreciate your excellent remarks, Congressman. I would say, No. 1, what we are really trying to do here is to take these youngsters off the streets during the hot summer months; No. 2, to expose them to the great out-of-doors.

I think this is the way you really do something about the problems that we face in our major urban areas.

I would list them probably in that order.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you very much.

Mr. DANIELS. The gentlelady from Oregon, Mrs. Green.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

It is good to see you here, Senator Jackson. I must say I have

wished that we could have substituted this for some of the millions of dollars that have been spent on the study of juvenile delinquency.

If we would shelve this idea of studying it and do something about it, we would be much further ahead.

This kind of a program makes sense. I must say I agree with my colleague from Michigan, that I see no conflict with manpower training programs. At the moment at least I would favor putting it in Interior and Agriculture as you have suggested.

How many youngsters do you think could be handled in this program during the summer?

Senator JACKSON. Mrs. Green, this is a matter of conjecture. I would think that we can gear up very rapidly after this pilot program has been tried, perhaps to as many as 100,000 youth per year. The pilot program, authorized in the Senate-passed bill, calls for a nominal expenditure of \$3.5 million. The cost per youngster would be about \$1,100, and as a result, approximately 3,000 youth could be hired each year.

This does not allow much of a payment to the youngster, but it does include, of course, the housing and transportation costs that are essential to the operation of the program.

Mrs. GREEN. I have become very disillusioned over the Job Corps program and the administration of it. It seems to me that poor judgment has been exercised.

One of my concerns has been this business of busing kids across the country from Florida to Oregon and from Oregon to Florida. Would you agree to writing in some limitation, that participants should—where feasible—be close to their area. We have written that same language or similar language into the Job Corps, but it has been ignored by the people who have administered it.

What about tightening up the language so we would stop this expense?

Senator JACKSON. I agree, Mrs. Green. I think you have made an excellent point. This disturbed me. That is why we put in the restrictive language. I certainly wouldn't object to further tightening of that language.

The pilot program will be so limited that I don't believe we will have any difficulty in misinterpretation of this language. We would have to take the youngsters some distance, of course, because most of them will not be residing near the national forests or the national parks or other federally owned lands.

But I agree with you. I think that part of the trouble of the Job Corps program was caused by the difficulty in connection with moving youngsters over tremendous distances without proper preplanning.

Mrs. GREEN. Over a period of years, I have also become disillusioned about the breaks that young girls get in such programs. The Job Corps is an eloquent example. It seems to me that there are many programs that girls could be involved in in our national parks. What about some kind of requirement to this effect, because in the administration of all of these programs, we find that the number of girls is a fraction of the number of boys.

The statistics show that the highest unemployment rate in the Nation is among the 16- to 21-year-old nonwhite girls.

Senator JACKSON. There is an opportunity, certainly, for their employment in connection with these same Federal activities. As you



know, both of the bills under consideration today have provisions for the hiring of 14- to 18-year-old girls. In addition, there are currently office and food type requirements that must be met in our national parks and forests. I am certain that the Park Service and the Forest Service will open up other areas of opportunity for young women, if Congress will just give strong directives to the Departments.

The Forest Service and Park Service haven't had too much experience in this regard. Most of the girls who work in the Park Service, as you know, are college girls waiting on tables for the concessionaires. They are not direct Federal employees.

Mrs. GREEN. I reject the philosophy for the 1970's that jobs for girls should be in clerical office work and in waiting on tables. In fact, I think I would vote against this program, Senator, if this is the way we are going to start out. If we are talking about wildlife, we are also talking about conservation and jobs in that field. It seems to me that when girls, women, are even becoming Senators and engineers and doctors and lawyers, then we could get away from this concept of relegating them to the kitchen and the office chair.

Senator JACKSON. Mrs. Green, I couldn't agree with you more. But there is a special precedent, shall we say, in connection with summer employment in the national parks. As you probably know, the number of college girls who want to work in the large resorts are so substantial in number that they can't come close to fulfilling the requests.

All I was trying to avoid was to say that the girls should be out with pick and shovel on the trails, and doing hard manual labor like they do in Russia and Eastern European countries. I didn't want to be accused of that.

Mrs. GREEN. These are not the two alternatives. If I may suggest it, maybe the pilot project is the time to establish new precedents for what girls could do in terms of conservation and wildlife study.

Senator JACKSON. I think what I would say is that, of course, a number of the college students could be instructors in botany, biology and so on. But I was trying to find an answer to your question as to what 14 to 18 year old disadvantaged girls might be able to do specifically in the national parks.

They do have engineering offices and that sort of thing, where they could play a role. But I would defer to the Chief of the Forest Service and the Park Service as to what areas could be opened up without putting them into tasks involving hard manual labor.

But I would certainly go along with you on the need to open this area.

Mrs. GREEN. I agree with you, the women of this country who get up at 5 o'clock in the morning and take care of anywhere from two to a dozen children, and lift a lot of things, are not used to hard manual labor.

May I ask how you define disadvantaged? All of the studies show that the increase in juvenile delinquency cuts across all lines. It isn't just the disadvantaged. How should we limit that program which is not really designed as a manpower training program? Why should we put this kind of a limitation on it, if it is a pilot program?

Senator JACKSON. I couldn't agree with you more, Mrs. Green. Before you came in, I made a strong plea to getting away from the Job Corps concept of just taking in disadvantaged youths. My plea to this committee is to depart from that base line and have a mixture.



My point is that if you are going to do something for the disadvantaged youth, he needs to be exposed to the youth from a better background. I think this same idea can work as well in reverse.

I want to say that I think something must be done about the problem of the affluent youth, which I think is a major problem in this country. The leaders of the most violent revolts that we have had in many cases are youngsters who come from affluent backgrounds.

In fact, the great revolutions that have occurred in the world have not been led by the poor and the downtrodden. They have been led by the sons of the nobility and affluent parents.

So, I want to say that the youngsters who have had more advantages and more affluent backgrounds can learn something from the poor. The poor can learn something from the rich. It is that type mixture I am striving for.

Mrs. GREEN. I would like to see that preference for the disadvantaged deleted from the bill because from past experience downtown they will interpret it as exclusively the disadvantaged since there are so many of them and, as a result, we won't have this cross section represented.

Senator JACKSON. I had it out of my original bill, but this was the result of the committee process. I hope I have made my position clear on the need for a mixture here.

Mrs. GREEN. I agree with my colleague from Washington, and I think those of us from the Northwest do understand the great demands in terms of people using our national parks and our forests and the conservation work and the improvement of campsites and so on that could be done, and at the same time afford the opportunity to young people to get away from the asphalt for at least the summer months.

Let me make one other suggestion and ask your reaction to that, Senator Jackson.

This program is designed for the summer. In Portland, we have what seems to me an unusually fine program. It is called "One Week in the Outdoors." It is for sixth graders. All of the sixth graders take their turns. But we have certain campsites within a reasonable distance of Portland.

These sixth graders go out for 1 week during the year, and, from my own personal knowledge, I think it is one of the most exciting existing programs. The youngsters have a chance to study nature, wildlife, and conservation. They learn to work and play with each other in a setting which is entirely different than the home and the school.

Since this is a summer program, how about combining it with such a program as that at least in one or two places, as a pilot or a demonstration project, to see if it would work. You would have your campsites already. It would seem to me that the cost would not be too great. Perhaps our education programs could provide funds; for example, title I and II of the ESEA.

I would think it could come under title I or title III.

Senator JACKSON. I think it is an excellent idea. I would have to defer to the Forest Service officials and the Park Service officials as to administrative problems, if any.

If they felt that it was a definite possibility, then I think the language here should be modified to give them that degree of flexibility.



I would see also a great deal of circumferential benefit coming out of a youth conservation program of this kind. A youngster who has had the summer exposure of 90 days away from his family is going to go back to his family and he is going to take his younger brother by the hand and say, "Look, you know, why don't we go up in the mountains? Why don't we go up in the mountains during the winter period for a day, or join with such and such a group to go skiing?"

What we are trying in part to do here is to provide a catalyst within the family structure to encourage these youngsters to get into the out-of-doors.

I was saying at the outset, Mrs. Green, in the city of Seattle, we have a minority district composed of about 40,000 black people. Well, over half of them have never been to our Woodland Park, which is only 4 to 5 miles from the central area of Seattle. Virtually none of them has been into the national forest 40 minutes away; to Mount Rainier, which is 2 hours away; to Olympic National Park, which is only an hour and a half away; and to the North Cascades, an hour and a half.

This is incredible. What I am trying to do in part is to fill a void in the family structure. I think much of this problem relates to the weakness of the family. In many instances, the father is not there to take the youngster hiking. The youngster has never heard about going on a camping trip, because there is no one to encourage him.

I think Federal programs that strengthen family life go a long way toward getting at the heart of the trouble in our major urban areas of America and elsewhere.

Mrs. GREEN. Do you see this in any way as a program where the Agriculture Department would use youngsters for fighting forest fires?

Senator JACKSON. Yes. But I think there again you would have to leave it to the discretion of the administrators. A 17- or 18-year-old youngster could be very helpful in fighting forest fires. There might be some reluctance about a 14-year-old or a 15-year-old. But a 17- or 18-year-old certainly could do it.

I worked in a sawmill pulling 12 by 12's—commonly referred to as planks—over the planer at the age of 16 in Everett. Certainly these youngsters have all the ability in the world to cope with such things as forest fires.

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I can't think of a better expenditure of \$31½ million for actually accomplishing something instead of just talking about it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. DANIELS. Senator, in response to a question from the gentlewoman from Oregon—Mrs. Green—you estimated about 3,000 young boys and girls would be enrolled in this program at a cost of approximately \$1,100 each.

I understand that the cost in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program per enrollee is \$400. Can you justify the difference between the two programs?

Senator JACKSON. I am not familiar with the Neighborhood Youth Corps program costs. We came up with this figure after conferring with the Forest Service officials and the Park Service officials. The pay here, Mr. Chairman, would be much less in terms of dollars than what is involved in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. One

must keep in mind, however, that this cost of \$1,000 per youngster includes shelter, and food and transportation.

So, in the end, I think it is the same, and maybe I would add that they will bring home more money at the end of the 90 days than they would in the city.

I have a copy of the breakdown of the costs. I can submit that for the record, if that would be agreeable. I can mention that logistics, clothing, subsistence, medical, and recreation comes to \$235; center operations, motor vehicles, center facilities, utilities, supplies, comes to \$150. Center staff salaries of a 200-man center, \$406; youth salary pay of \$80 a month, \$250; overhead, \$65; center travel expenses, \$27; makes a subtotal of \$738; bringing it to a total cost per enrollee for the 90-day summer program of \$1,123.

I think this is quite reasonable.

Mr. MEEDS. If the Chairman would yield, the Senator would agree with me that on the breakdown he has just given that the correct comparison with the Neighborhood Youth Corps program and what we have just stated would be the \$240 salary and some supervision, because the Neighborhood Youth Corps program is primarily a job program and includes compensation for the job without the costs of board, room, transportation, all of the things which would be involved here.

Mr. DANIELS. I knew what the difference was. But I wanted it spread upon the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

#### COST ESTIMATES

The following are the estimated per enrollee costs for a 90-day summer Youth Conservation Corps program :

##### Logistics :

Clothing -----	\$55
Subsistence -----	150
Medical -----	20
Recreation -----	10

Subtotal, logistics per enrollee-----	235
---------------------------------------	-----

##### Center operations :

Motor vehicles-----	90
Center facilities-----	15
Utilities -----	30
Supplies -----	15

Subtotal -----	150
----------------	-----

Center staff salaries (200-man center)-----	406
Youth (salary) pay (\$80 per month)-----	240
Overhead -----	65
Center travel expenses-----	27

Subtotal -----	738
----------------	-----

Total cost per enrollee for 90-day summer program-----	1, 123
--	--------

Mr. DANIELS. Just one further question. I know later on this morning a witness will appear to express his objection to this legislation because of the short-term nature of the proposed project, the fact that youths could not remain over 90 days which would mean a constant change and substantially limiting their learning experience.



I would like to have your comment on that statement.

Senator JACKSON. The last thing we would want to do would be to take youngsters 14 to 18 years of age and put them in a program on a year-round basis away from their own schools.

The whole thrust of the effort here, Mr. Chairman, is to fill this summer void in a way in which the youngster, his family, and the Government profits. We do employ now, as was brought out here earlier, a number of young men 18 and over in our national forests and our national parks during the summer months.

The facts are that the needs are only for this period in the national parks and in most of the national forests. This is the time—June, July, and August—when you can do the work in that area. So, the two dovetail. The youngsters are out of school during those 3 months; the need for this extra work is in those 3 months.

I point out, in addition, Mr. Chairman, the opportunity to obtain qualified elementary, secondary, and university instructors and administrators during the summer months to supervise this program. Also, there is an opportunity here to employ college students in the natural resource and education disciplines as youth counselors to gain valuable practical experience and possibly obtain college credits.

This will avoid the building up of a year-round staff. There are thousands of teachers, who are also Boy Scout leaders and camp leaders, all of whom have a deep and dedicated interest in this kind of program. These people are available during these summer months of June, July, and August. These people are not available year round. So, we have a nucleus of talent that dovetails perfectly with this program.

Mr. DANIELS. Senator Jackson, I want to compliment you for your testimony. It was very persuasive and informative.

Again, on behalf of the committee, I express our sincere thanks.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, may I express my deep appreciation to you for the fine manner in which you have handled this hearing this morning. I want to say that it has been extremely helpful to me to have a chance to exchange views and try to explain the objectives of this program.

Mr. DANIELS. We will now hear the statement of our colleague, the Honorable Wendell H. Wyatt of the State of Oregon.

#### **STATEMENT OF HON. WENDELL WYATT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON**

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the members of this distinguished group for allowing me the opportunity to testify in behalf of the Youth Conservation Corps Act.

Summer in recent years has brought crime and violence to our city streets. Many youngsters without summer jobs have little to do but roam these streets, with the possibility of adding to the disorder, or perhaps even contributing the spark that inflames a major conflagration. Especially in our urban areas, youths of every background, not just the poor and the underprivileged, are unable to find summer employment.

This Youth Conservation Corps Act would help provide such jobs. It is a low-cost program, but one with a potential high yield. It would provide work experiences for the the volatile 14- to 18-year-old segment of our population. In this age where the relevancy of any activity is:

questioned by our youth, it would provide constructive involvement in the maintenance and upgrading of our important national resources.

This healthy, outdoor work in our national parks and national forests could be the first time a city youngster comes in contact with the wealth of our national resources and the great outdoors. Such employment could lead to increased interest and possibly eventual careers in such professions as forestry, land management, and outdoor recreation. It would certainly increase the awareness of the importance of our resources and their upkeep among the participating youths.

Cutting across the artificial barriers of economics, race, and social background, this program would bring together many different backgrounds and life styles in healthy, outdoor surroundings. Working together these youngsters could reach a greater understanding of each other and a closer feeling of working together for the benefit of the Nation.

Our country's youth is its greatest resource and greatest asset. It should be developed to its full potential. The Youth Conservation Corps Act would provide meaningful summer employment for youngsters and would develop this potential to the highest degree. I strongly urge your favorable consideration of this legislation.

Thank you, once again, for allowing me this opportunity to testify.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you. I am sure that you have made a fine contribution to the deliberation of this committee.

Our next witness is the Honorable Arnold Weber, Assistant Secretary for Manpower, Department of Labor.

Mr. Weber, you may proceed.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ARNOLD WEBER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MANPOWER, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR; ACCOMPANIED BY WILLIAM H. KOLBERG, ASSOCIATE MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR OF POLICY, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH, MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION**

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, though I have appeared before the full committee before this, this is my first appearance before this subcommittee. I am very pleased to have this occasion to appear. I have brought with me on my right, Mr. William Kolberg, who is Director of our Office of Policy, Evaluation, and Research, in the Manpower Administration, Department of Labor.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the Department of Labor is pleased to come before the subcommittee this morning and present our views on two bills, H.R. 11145 and S. 1076, which would establish a Youth Conservation Corps to provide short-term employment opportunities for youth within the field of conservation of our natural resources.

Earlier this session, the Manpower Administrator expressed opposition to S. 1076 in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As the bill moved through the Senate, a number of modifications were made which accommodated some of our objections. Despite these revisions, S. 1076 is still an employment measure which does not provide the full services required for any effective manpower program.



Moreover, this bill would add another categorical program in a form that would inhibit its coordination with existing manpower programs. Therefore, our basic objections still remain.

The House bill, H.R. 11145, partially accommodates our objective to the Senate bill by:

—placing primary responsibility for the Youth Conservation Corps in the Department of Labor;

—requiring coordination with other Federal manpower and job training programs for youth;

—providing for consultation with the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture to carry out authorized programs of conservation.

Nevertheless, the Department of Labor strongly recommends that manpower development and training programs be fully coordinated within a total approach to the Nation's manpower effort. The President established such a goal in his manpower message to the Congress and in the administration's proposed Manpower Training Act, H.R. 13472, sponsored by several members of this committee.

The subject bill (H.R. 11145) to establish the Youth Conservation Corps conflicts with the basic objectives of the proposed Manpower Training Act and other bills introduced by Members of the House which are designed to rationalize the Nation's manpower programs. The Department is in agreement with the congressional concern to maintain our national resources and to instill in our youth an appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. The Department fully understands the benefits to be obtained for linking youth employment and conservation programs.

However, there is a broad range of manpower development and training problems that have an equal claim to "special focus" legislation. Indeed, our present manpower program is a collection of legislation whose narrow scope and inflexibility have prevented the development of a comprehensive approach to manpower problems.

Both the Congress and the Department are now expressing their preference for a coordinated manpower program to achieve an appropriate balance among programs for youth and adults, skilled and unskilled, educated and uneducated.

Such an approach would resolve the problems of competition for funds among special interest programs, dual accountability within programs authorized by various funding sources, and the rigidity arising from differential statutory requirements among programs.

In view of these developments we believe that H.R. 11145 is undesirable because it endorses further fragmentation at the very time we are attempting to achieve unification.

Further, it is unnecessary because its goals can be achieved through either present statutory authority, such as the MDTA and the EOA, or the broader scope of proposed legislation such as the MTA.

When I say it can be accomplished now, let me describe an excellent program which has provided an almost identical type of work experience for youngsters. The Department supported an experimental and demonstration project this past summer to explore the feasibility of providing disadvantaged youth with a residential program of work experience in the Sierra National Forest in central California's Sierra Nevada Mountains.

The 10-week program for 48 young men was operated by the Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission in cooperation with the Fresno County Department of Education and Sierra National Forest, U.S. Forest Service.

This special project to blend the development of our natural and human resources was established not as a separate self-contained effort, but as a component of the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program for disadvantaged Fresno youth. Existing public and private community resources were utilized to meet the needs of these youth.

The project was located within 100 miles of the enrollees' home community and weekend home transportation was available. The basic program components of education, counseling and work were inter-related to enhance the meaningfulness of the total program.

Enrollees participated in a camp-based community college course in conservation and development of natural resources. Counselors assisted the young men in education and career planning.

The preliminary reports on this project are encouraging:

—safety first was achieved without a single disabling injury or lost work day.

—enrollment capacity was maintained all summer.

—conservation of natural resources was visible in dam construction and trail building.

—human resource development was reflected in:

(a) enrollee work habits and motivation to continue education after the school vacation period,

(b) employment and college placement for those youth who graduated high school in June, and

(c) the earning of community college credits by most enrollees, including those who will not graduate from high school for a year or more.

It is noteworthy that this special summer project was inspired and developed at the community level and was linked to existing local resources, thereby becoming an integral part of community manpower planning and programing.

As such, the overall effort is a good example of the intentions of the proposed Manpower Training Act of 1969. As I have already indicated, the project also illustrates our ability to provide expanded youth employment opportunities and conservation activities under present statutory authority.

I might further note that in 1968, approximately 4,000 Neighborhood Youth Corps summer enrollees were engaged in conservation work at the State and county, Federal or community level, of which 600 were engaged in activities in the national forests.

In 1969, that 600 figure has risen to 1,472. In addition to this, the Park Service had 779 summer trainees.

So, if you are talking about a pilot project, involving something like 3,000 youth, we already have many programs whose enrollment probably exceeds that number and are in one way or another related to conservation as well as providing experience for the enrollees.

The Department of Labor through the Neighborhood Youth Corps is also operating an extensive summer work-experience program. This past summer's program provided opportunities for 355,000 youth. A number of these projects as I indicated involved conservation work such as beautification, painting, tree trimming, and planting.



This experience plus the experimental project in Fresno has given the Department sound background for future development of conservation programs of the type proposed in these bills directed to summer activities for in-school youth.

The committee will be interested to know that during this past summer the Federal Government employed, throughout the Nation 67,500 disadvantaged youth in the 16 to 21 age bracket.

The JOBS program, under the supervision of the National Alliance of Businessmen, employed 170,000 disadvantaged youth this year. So the total number of summer employment provided under the aegis of government or government-related programs is close to or exceeds one-half million.

Therefore, I strongly urge that the committee not act favorably on the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps.

At this time, I am not prepared to comment in detail on the merits of the administration's Manpower Training Act. Hopefully, this bill, and the related proposals, will be the subject of extensive hearings by this committee later in this session.

However, I wish to emphasize that the subject bills (H.R. 11145 and S. 1076) are in general conflict with the approach of the MTA and other comprehensive manpower bills introduced in this session.

The youth of the country can be provided with work experience under programs already authorized, and the Department of Labor can and has worked closely with other Federal agencies to provide such activities.

At this time, there are many cooperative efforts with, for instance, the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, the Civil Service Commission, the Office of Economic Opportunity and public and private agencies, which accommodate the special needs of particular groups in the total sum of our manpower resources.

Finally, I must state explicitly that I believe the approach which I am urging for committee action is a positive one. My testimony in opposition to favorable action on the subject bills does not deny the Nation's concern for our youth or for conservation efforts.

Rather, I believe that their concerns can be effectively addressed by means other than categorized legislation that would further rigidify the manpower program.

Mr. Chairman, that completes my statement.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Weber, on page 3 of your statement you say that the proposed Youth Conservation Corps as envisioned in the proposed legislation conflicts with the basic objectives of the proposed Manpower Training Act.

Then on page 8 of your statement, you state you are not prepared to comment in detail on the merits of the administration's Manpower and Training Act.

The President's message to the Congress on the Manpower Training Act was issued from San Clemente, Calif., on August 12. On the same day, a bill was introduced by my colleague, ranking minority member, Mr. Ayres, in support of the President's message.

How does this proposed program particularly conflict with that, as you state, and yet you don't know what the Manpower Training Act proposes?

Mr. WEBER. Of course, I am aware of the proposal, Mr. Chairman. It is a matter of making a detailed presentation. We hope we will have

that opportunity soon and be able to put our best foot forward in detail.

But briefly, one of the primary objectives of the Manpower Training Act is to decategorize many of these programs which have developed over the last 5 to 7 years and have fixed funding relations, which serve fixed clientele groups.

New Careers is a program which serves a particular group. Neighborhood Youth Corps serves a particular group, MDTA in particular serves a particular group. We think all of these programs are meritorious. But we feel that if you are to have effective manpower programs you should provide for some flexibility at the community level so that funds go down without specific earmarking for certain programs. Rather these needs and programs can be determined by persons at the community and State level, and tailored to the particular needs of the community.

In some instances, you might have a problem of older workers and some instances of younger workers.

Mr. DANIELS. You were here this morning when the Senator, the main sponsor from the other body, set forth in some detail the thrust of this legislation. This is not strictly a training program. Its purpose is to accomplish something different: To try to cure some of the ills we have in the cities; which we have been troubled with for the past couple of years.

Mr. WEBER. Of course, sir, we are wholly sympathetic to the objectives that were articulated by Senator Jackson. We feel, as a matter of experience and research, that many of the problems of our cities are associated with the problems of employment. Recent surveys of teenage unemployment in our urban centers indicate that the level is really unbearable. As high as 25 percent in some instances and 30 percent of particular teenage components.

The thrust of many of our programs is to deal with the problems of city and youth unemployment by providing work experience, and training opportunities.

Mr. DANIELS. How do those programs reach down to the boy or girl who is 14, 15, or 16 years of age and barred from engaging in gainful occupation by many of our State laws?

Mr. WEBER. Of course, they do reach down to the 16-year-old, rarely to the 14-year-old. But I think as in everything else, we have limitations on resources. It is a matter of where you put your resources and where you can get the most favorable cost-benefit relationships.

One of the things that obviously concerns us is that the program contemplated by H.R. 11145 is a fairly expensive program in terms of providing summer employment.

In Senator Jackson's proposal, it comes out to approximately \$1,200. For the Neighborhood Youth Corps, your budget cost was \$424. I think it follows that any residential program is going to be a relatively high cost program.

Mr. DANIELS. You heard Senator Jackson distinguish between the two programs, one program as proposed by his legislation and legislation proposed by my colleague, Mr. Meeds, which covers transportation, maintenance, clothing, so that there is a distinction between the two.



Mr. WEBER. That is correct. But it is often, I feel that way when I buy a car and am told I am getting a good deal, although I don't want that stereo speaker in the back. Even though it reflects efficiency in terms of the cost of that program, many of the components of that program might be viewed as unnecessary within the context of developing an effective manpower effort.

Mr. DANIELS. With what specific programs already in existence would the proposed legislation conflict?

Mr. WEBER. Two in particular: One would be the Neighborhood Youth Corps; the summer program, which as we indicated enrolled 355,000 young people this past summer; it would also conflict or compliment or duplicate, if you will, certain aspects of the Job Corps.

Under the Job Corps program today, there are approximately 6,000 young people enrolled in the conservation centers. Of course, there the work experience is associated in a large measure with conservation efforts, although we are working very hard to also relate that to meaningful training for real jobs in the labor market, particularly through cooperation with trade unions.

Mr. DANIELS. Assuming this committee should favorably report this legislation, I would like to have your comment on whether or not the program should be placed in the Department of Labor, or with the Department of Agriculture and Interior as proposed in the Senate bill.

Mr. WEBER. In my opening statement, I indicated that we thought that the House version of this bill represented an improvement in the sense that it did place responsibility for the program in the Department of Labor.

Obviously, we would work very closely with Interior and Agriculture in implementing those provisions which related to employment in the National Park Service.

We do this in connection with the Job Corps, most of the conservation centers are run by Interior and Agriculture on a delegate basis, and with some components of the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program.

Mr. DANIELS. I would like to call upon the author of H.R. 11145, the gentleman from Washington, Congressman Meeds.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Weber, I hope that I am not going to be overly unkind to you, but let me say at the outset that I don't think in all my service on this committee I have ever seen such an inconsistent statement as the one you have just presented to this subcommittee.

You say on page 1 that this proposal does not provide the full services required for an effective manpower program, and then later in your statement, you cite as an excellent example of this type of program, which you are now able to operate, a program which is very similar to the one which we are proposing here. You say that this legislation conflicts with the overall goals of the manpower programs. Then you say that you can do this same type of thing under the proposals you are making under the manpower programs.

I just can't reconcile those statements. Please take a moment to reply.

Mr. WEBER. I hope beneath that apparent surface of inconsistencies, lies a stream of logic.

Mr. MEEDS. I certainly hope so, too.

Mr. WEBER. The objectives of H.R. 11145, as specified by Senator Jackson, and now yourself, is to get kids in the open spaces, to abet conservation, and these are the two major objectives.

We feel, under the experiment that is described in my testimony, that we have achieved the same objectives, but in addition to this, have within the framework of an NYC program added additional services which make it into a bona fide manpower program.

Those additional services were intensive counseling, training in particular work skills, effective liaison between a local community college and the program.

Beyond that, this was a program that was based in the community. It was developed by community leaders, it involved community institutions, and it kept kids within an area so they could relate to their own environment.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Weber, do you see in any place in the bills we are proposing that that cannot be done?

In any instance, is there any prohibition in any of these bills against doing what you just stated?

Mr. WEBER. I don't think there is a prohibition against it, but if you added the services that we have priced out in this program at \$800 per enrollee and add to that approximately the \$1,200, obviously you would come close to \$1,600. Then the issue would fall on the matter of cost.

Mr. MEEDS. Do you, having studied the Sierra program, recognize the amount of contributions from the local level, that you have costed out at \$800? I think they add up to approximately \$400 per enrollee worth of donated services.

Do you see any prohibition against donating services in either of the bills that Senator Jackson or I have proposed?

Mr. WEBER. Of course, there isn't a prescription on donation of local services. We have that in many of our programs.

On the other hand, we find that you get greater involvement in the community, the greater likelihood of donation of services by the community where the community develops the program itself, where it is involved and supports it and relates to teenagers who live and go to school in that community.

Within the framework of the Manpower Training Act, just this sort of activity will be facilitated and we hope encouraged, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. How many programs of this nature do you contemplate in fiscal 1970 under your present manpower bill?

Mr. WEBER. Of course, we don't contemplate it in the specific sense, because the initiative for developing many of the programs and the particular nature of the program lies with the local sponsor.

Mr. MEEDS. In other words, if it happens, you will be satisfied and if it doesn't happen, you will also be satisfied, is that correct?

Mr. WEBER. No, sir. That is not correct.

Mr. MEEDS. Do you think it should happen?

Mr. WEBER. If I might follow through, we initiated this experiment. The experiment took place over the last summer. We think the results of the experiment are encouraging.

Following our normal procedures, we will then review our planning for the next fiscal year. We will consult as appropriate with the various prime sponsors to the extent that they think it is appropriate and to



the extent that we could provide technical assistance in this direction.

Mr. MEEDS. So, what you are telling me is if it happens, it is going to be all right, but you are not putting any emphasis on it. I am suggesting to you that this is specifically and exactly why we have come forward with this bill. Mrs. Green pointed out here earlier that she wishes this type of thing had been done sometime ago instead of planning and researching and, in other words, putting our money where our mouth has been.

You come in and tell us, maybe it will happen, and maybe it won't. We are concerned about it. We want to see it happen. We think it takes a national emphasis to get it started. I see nothing inconsistent with the Federal Government having a pilot program as this is, and then making the results of that pilot program available to the State and local agencies. I would like to see them run it, too.

Would you tell me, under what existing legislation you have the specific type of program we are proposing can be operated, anywhere in the Federal structure?

Mr. WEBER. It could be operated under the Neighborhood Youth Corps, as I indicated, particularly the summer program, but also out-of-school program.

Mr. MEEDS. Have you read this legislation closely?

Mr. WEBER. Yes, I have, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. Anywhere in H.R. 11145, do you see the word "underprivileged"?

Mr. WEBER. No, sir, quite to the contrary. On line 20 of page 2, or beginning on line 19, it says "members of the corps shall be appointed without regard to geographical location or economic status."

Mr. MEEDS. Under what program in NYC can you run this type of program?

Mr. WEBER. What I am suggesting to you is we can run programs which serve the objectives of the act in terms of abetting conservation and in terms of providing—

Mr. MEEDS. But don't you see, you are overlooking something that ought to be very obvious to you. This is not a poverty program. This is not an employment program. This is not a program specifically and only for underprivileged people or youth. You don't have an NYC program that applies to the type of persons we are talking about, do you?

Mr. WEBER. We don't have NYC programs that apply specifically to children from middle class families or from affluent families.

On the other hand, we do have manpower development and training programs which don't have income requirements but rather have requirements in terms of unemployment status and in terms of upgrading the particular skills.

If you are talking directly to the point of whether or not, as a matter of policy, the Department of Labor, given the heavy demands and the extensive needs to deal with teenage unemployment in this country, would endorse a program which provides—for twice the cost—for sending kids from middle-class families or upper-class families to perform park services. The Department's point of view, in our judgment, would be that this is not an effective use of public funds, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. You are adding a lot of embellishment to it, but what it comes down to is, you would not, and you do not, have a program under which any other than disadvantaged people or unemployed people can participate, do you?

Mr. WEBER. No, sir. That is by and large correct. Obviously, that is where we focus our resources.

Mr. MEEDS. Your program, your Sierra program, which you supported specifically required that they be underprivileged, didn't it?

Mr. WEBER. That is correct.

Mr. MEEDS. There was not one young person in that group that was not underprivileged?

Mr. WEBER. I must say that this was the cream of that crop in the sense that all of them were in school. Many of them subsequently graduated. Several went on to college and 10 used this occasion as an opportunity to find jobs that were related in large measure to conservation.

Mr. MEEDS. I think the Sierra program is an excellent program. As a matter of fact, the one we are proposing is very similar to it, but not exactly, and it is the kind of program we are proposing can utilize the experiences of the Sierra program and can add to them.

The thing the Senator and I are trying to accomplish is the mixture of people from different socio-economic backgrounds so that both, advantaged and disadvantaged, can gain from each other. It is a very important aspect which you have completely overlooked in your testimony.

Mr. WEBER. Of course, our general position, Congressman Meeds, is that this program would fall between two schools. That is, if you are interested in conservation, it is subject to the judgment of can you carry out conservation more effectively given alternative uses of the resources.

If you are interested in manpower programs, from the details, defined by us from the list of expenses, there doesn't seem to be a very substantial manpower component.

Mr. MEEDS. It is pretty obvious from your testimony, Mr. Weber, that you have been unable to contemplate, to grasp, the idea of combining these two things.

Mr. WEBER. No, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. I am extremely upset that you come before this subcommittee with the testimony which you have given.

Mr. WEBER. We would say that if we could combine them, we presently have vehicles to do so, essentially at half the cost and providing a better program.

Obviously, one of our responsibilities, particularly in looking at the development of a new program, which has manpower components, is the considerations of efficiency. Within the framework of NYC, certainly efficiency recommends this approach.

Mr. MEEDS. Again, you are not touching the group that we talked about. Incidentally, if I may, Mr. Chairman, from the Sierra program, read into the record the direct cost per enrollee, and I am quoting from page 19 of that program, direct costs per enrollee, 48 enrollees less 15 percent fade in and out absenteeism, \$1,097 rather than the \$800 which you have quoted to this committee.

Mr. WEBER. I would have to see those figures, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. You have the report, don't you? It is funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, OSMT grant No. 42-9-09-05.

Mr. WEBER. That is correct. Beyond that, whether it is \$1,090 or \$800, there is a very important consideration about which we would be concerned. We hope to permit local communities to make a choice,



if they get a certain apportionment. They do now under NYC. That apportionment comes out of Washington subject to some assessment of needs.

They have to ask themselves, "Do we want to initiate a program which costs \$1,100 per slot to provide summer youth employment opportunities," or do they want \$424 a slot for some intermediate position serving the different clientele.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Weber, in your testimony you are highly commendatory of a program that costs \$1,097 per enrollee, and that incidentally doesn't include \$5,000 for precamp donated by the American Forest Products, \$650 for use of a supply truck, and \$2,000 of equipment loaned on a closed Job Corps center.

Mrs. GREEN. Does the \$1,097 include board and room or is this a day program?

Mr. WEBER. Many of them go home over the weekend.

Mrs. GREEN. But stay there during the week?

Mr. WEBER. That is correct. So it was not in all instances a full-week program.

Of course, we are commendatory of the Sierra project and properly so as an experimental project. It is an experimental project which can be initiated within the framework of the NYC program.

Obviously, they cost more than the ongoing programs.

Mr. MEEDS. Are you willing to propose an amendment to the NYC program which would allow us to have involved in these programs other than disadvantaged people?

Mr. WEBER. No, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. So, there is the total inconsistency.

Mr. WEBER. I think that is an issue we could look at in those terms. The thrust of our manpower efforts, which involve \$1.6 billion in direct appropriations, or we hope, this fiscal year is aimed at the persons who hope to get a position in the labor market. Otherwise, they will face the prospect of chronic unemployment, lack of attachment to society which may result in many of the urban problems Senator Jackson mentioned and whose concern we share, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. I might, by way of closing here, point out the thrust of your employment problems which last summer left 1,436,000 young people unemployed in this Nation in the age group that we are talking about. No, the statistics begin at age 16; they don't even go as far down as we are going, 14. These are your own Labor Department figures.

Mr. WEBER. We share your concern over any youth unemployment. On the other hand, we do take some pride in the fact that through Neighborhood Youth Corps, by helping to mobilize the efforts of private business, and by enlisting the cooperation and involvement of the Federal Government, we did provide over half a million jobs. This is the highest total, it is my understanding, that our summer youth program has ever attained.

If you say we should do more in a constructive way aimed at kids who would otherwise be disadvantaged, I would certainly agree with you. We are just skimming the universal need in terms of these programs.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Secretary, to follow up the last question, can you furnish this committee with a survey as to the number of unemployed youths in this country between the age brackets of 14 and 19 during the months of June, July, and August of this past year?

Mr. WEBER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, may I amend that request to provide a time series of youth unemployment over the summer; that is, going back 5 or 6 years, because we know youth unemployment always rises during the summer as more young people are seeking employment.

Mr. DANIELS. Surely, if you care to go back 4 or 5 or 6 years, I leave that entirely up to you.

(The information referred to follows:)

UNEMPLOYED YOUTH (14 TO 19) RATE IN THE SUMMERS OF 1967, 1968, AND 1969

	1967	1968	1969
June.....	18.0	18.4	16.4
July.....	13.3	14.3	13.2
August.....	10.1	9.0	9.6

Mr. DANIELS. I would like to call upon my colleague, Mr. Esch.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am interested in my colleague's comments because I think they get to the heart of the problem we face as a country and as a committee. You suggested we had over one-half million youngsters employed in summer programs. He suggested that the problem was over twice that huge in terms of the unemployed.

Is that the reason why the goal of the Department and the Manpower Division has been to maximize use of whatever available funds this Congress has given you to make sure that, No. 1, a high priority is placed on disadvantaged youth, and also, secondly, to emphasize those programs which maximize dollar output in relationship to number employed?

Mr. WEBER. Yes, sir. I think you have touched on the two prime considerations that we have tried to follow in developing our budget and our program. The first is the matter of targeting. That means given the fact that there are limitations on the resources we have, we should use those resources in such a way as to accommodate the most prominent problems and to help those who are less likely to help themselves.

Congressman, our fiscal 1970 budget calls for approximately 1 million training opportunities, work experience opportunities. Over 700,000 of those are focused on young people.

Mr. ESCH. Of another factor which you alluded to, which perhaps is most significant, given the high need in this age level, and given the fact that apparently we in Congress have given you limited resources, is this another reason why you attempt to maximize community involvement and utilization of the private sector, from the standpoint of maximizing opportunities?

Mr. WEBER. Yes, sir; and of course this is particularly true in terms of the National Alliance for Business effort. Although we have an appropriation, these are used for so-called contract placements.

Mr. ESCH. So that, in effect, the Sierra operation was an example of how this could be accomplished?

Mr. WEBER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ESCH. I think that we are at the heart of the problem in that we recognize there is a conflict in goals here. On the one hand, the



present bill under consideration, probably in no way could attempt to maximize community involvement because it is in direct relationship with the Interior Department.

This is probably one of the problems that we face as we discuss the bill.

The other question that I have would be directed to the Chairman.

With due respect, Mr. Chairman, it was mentioned by the Assistant Secretary today that he was not ready to comment directly on the manpower bill, but I would hope we could start hearings on that bill very soon.

I would ask the distinguished Chairman if he had any plans directly and we might get the Assistant Secretary up to comment on it.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Esch, I would respond to you in this fashion: This committee has not been standing idly by. It has been dealing with other important legislation.

We handled and had enacted into law a bill dealing with health and safety in federally financed construction projects. In addition, we concluded hearings, and a bill is before the House or scheduled to come before the House today, dealing with health and safety in mines, which contains a provision dealing with payment of benefits to miners who suffer from pneumoconiosis or have died from pneumoconiosis. Those hearings were rather extensive. We have also commenced hearings on occupational health and safety.

We had a number of hearings scheduled during the past month or two which were canceled by the chairman of the full committee by virtue of the executive sessions called on other bills.

We have interrupted the occupational health and safety hearings to conduct the hearing on this bill this morning. I only have a limited capacity. I am only one human being.

If we stretch the days from 24 to 48 hours and make our weeks longer I would probably get to manpower sooner.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, my question in no way wanted to reflect disregard for the great output of this subcommittee. In fact, I think it has been one of the most productive ones in Congress. But I share with you the deep concern for occupational health and safety.

Mr. DANIELS. In addition thereto, I serve as a chairman of the Select Committee on Insurance and Health and Retirement, which had a landmark bill signed into law by the President, the day before yesterday.

So, I am only a human being.

Mr. ESCH. I am sure that many people in the Federal employment are indebted to you for that piece of legislation.

My only concern is that we move ahead as quickly as possible.

Mr. DANIELS. I give you this assurance. We will get to it as quickly as possible. I am hopeful we can begin hearings on that bill before the end of this session.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, I share your regard for the energies of Congress. In the last 10 days I have appeared before one committee or another during nine of them.

Mr. ESCH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I hope in reference to this direct bill that we might in this committee give direction as to where this proper jurisdiction for the bill or the thrust of the measure is. If it does belong and the emphasis

should be apart from the manpower, then we ought to determine whether it be under the jurisdiction of Interior or Labor.

Mr. DANIELS. I thank you for that statement.

The gentlelady from Oregon, Mrs. Green.

Mrs. GREEN. Yes, I am glad to welcome you to the committee, Mr. Weber.

As you know, I have applauded your efforts and the Secretary's efforts in trying to reorganize all of the manpower training programs. I wish you the best. I hope in a 7-day week you can bring some order out of all the chaos and inefficiency that has occurred.

Mr. WEBER. It is still an open question.

Mrs. GREEN. Where do we stand on the mini centers? Has a single one opened?

Mr. WEBER. Yes, there are two that are opened. One is opened in New Jersey, and that was moved from Newark. One is open in Honolulu. The opening of two additional ones are imminent. One is in Atlanta and the other is in Phoenix.

When we talk about the mini centers, these are the largest of the mini centers. There were 30 scheduled, as you know. Of the 30 approximately 15 are small residential support centers of 25. Others provide a wider array of services and have an enrollment of 200 to 300.

It is those that we are pushing.

We are also, I am told, on the verge of signing a contract in Portland.

Mrs. GREEN. How close are you to that verge?

Mr. WEBER. The latest report that I received said within 2 weeks. I know the Director of the Job Corps was out there for a visit. One of the major problems we have had with establishing all of these centers is site selection, that is, getting the site which is large enough, which doesn't involve excessive rehabilitation costs and what have you.

Mrs. GREEN. Are these going to be 12-month centers?

Mr. WEBER. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. What are you going to do with these youngsters in the summertime? Are you working in cooperation with the local schools?

Mr. WEBER. Where possible.

Mrs. GREEN. What are you going to do with them in the summer?

Mr. WEBER. They are going to be following through their normal program that involves education, intensive counseling, skill training. As you know, we put a very heavy emphasis on the skill training component.

Mrs. GREEN. Why, with a little imagination and ingenuity, couldn't you combine the program like the one which Senator Jackson and Congressman Meeds are recommending with these mini residential centers, many of them located in large urban areas so that for 70 or 90 days out of the year these youngsters would have an opportunity to be out in the beautiful forests and parks. Having this incorporated into their year-round training, I think, would eliminate all of your objections to such a program, although I must say I don't agree with all of your objections.

Mr. WEBER. Obviously, the planning process and the scope of the program would not preclude activities like that. It depends upon the employability plan that would be developed by the counselor at the center for the individual trainees.



You know, Congresswoman Green, that this is precisely what we do in the conservation centers which presently have an enrollment of around 5,800 to 6,000, where indeed we relate training to conservation work and an exposure to a different environment in that setting.

Mrs. GREEN. I am not one of those who looks at all the programs just in terms of the actual dollars. I would like to know how they are working a little bit.

But I do note that you are cutting back for the fiscal year 1970, for instance, in Job Corps, and I must say I heartily approve of this, if you will provide slots in other places for these youngsters.

A moment ago you mentioned that you have 1 million training slots in 1970, that this is your goal.

Could you tell me where those million are?

For instance, could we go down a list here? I don't think you prepared this, but I am concerned. I thought that the Neighborhood Youth Corps was one of the most successful programs we have ever had—the in-school, the out-of-school, and the summer one.

You spoke in glowing terms of your summer programs in NYC and yet, you are cutting back in that for 1970. You are cutting back in the out of school Neighborhood Youth Corps. You are increasing by about \$9 million the NYC for the summer. Is that correct?

Mr. WEBER. Our request is the same. Let me respond to the general question and pick up some of the specifics.

For summer NYC, it is \$121½ million. The enrollment in NYC in the previous summer reflected that basic appropriation of \$121.5 million plus the effect of a supplemental of \$7½ million, which was passed as an amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act in early July as I recall, plus some reprogramming of the EOA 1B money, which took place in June, and brought it up to \$140 million in terms of overall expenditures there.

So, we have responded as we viewed the situation.

Mrs. GREEN. Can I just go down the list. In Job Corps, how many slots do you expect to have for 1970?

Mr. WEBER. 21,646.

Mrs. GREEN. Year round?

Mr. WEBER. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. GREEN. In Operation Mainstream, exclusive of CB?

Mr. WEBER. 12,200.

Mrs. GREEN. NYC out of school?

Mr. WEBER. 32,500. I might explain that is a reduction from 50,347. We are in the process of implementing the redesign of NYC out of school. NYC out of school has been a program which has existed for 5 years. We took a hard look at it. We saw that it had many deficiencies. In terms of retention, the average recruiter retention was something like 12 weeks. In terms of the subsequent expense of the trainees, we found out that less than 50 percent of them had returned to school or found gainful employment through the program.

So the cutback, in a sense, is one, to focus in on 16- and 17-year-olds who are the true school dropouts and try to get those between 18 and 21 into useful employment, primarily through MDTA and the JOBS program.

So the shift doesn't reflect a reduction in resources, but rather an effort to target resources for the 16- and 17-year-olds in contrast to

the 16- to 22-year-old that is presently served by the NYC out of school program.

Mrs. GREEN. If I may, I would ask unanimous consent to request Mr. Weber to outline these million slots so we don't take the time this morning on that. Then I could turn to two or three other questions.

Mr. DANIELS. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

(The information referred to follows:)

MDTA :

JOBS -----	80, 000
CEP -----	35, 300
Institutional training-----	99, 900
OJT -----	65, 000
Part-time and others -----	20, 400
Incentives to States (title V)-----	10, 000
Disadvantaged youth -----	43, 300
Subtotal -----	303, 700

EOA :

Job Corps-----	21, 646
JOBS -----	60, 000
CEP -----	133, 000
In school (NYC)-----	100, 000
Summer (NYC)-----	291, 000
Out of school (NYC)-----	32, 500
Operation Mainstream-----	12, 200
Public Service Careers-----	27, 800
Subtotal -----	678, 146

WIN:

OJT -----	19, 700
Institutional and work experience-----	31, 500
Work projects -----	20, 000
Subtotal -----	71, 200
Total -----	1, 053, 046

Mrs. GREEN. You have mentioned the 16- to 17-year-olds just now and you have before. What programs provide anything for 14- or 15-year-olds?

Mr. WEBER. None of them do.

Mrs. GREEN. None at all?

Mr. WEBER. No, including the Job Corps, where, of course, there is a statutory guide.

Mrs. GREEN. We made a provision that you could include 14-year-olds. Wasn't the law amended so the 14-year-olds could be included in that?

Mr. WEBER. I am not sure of that.

Mrs. GREEN. I am quite sure that it was.

I was trying to remember if it went through the conference. I know I put it in the amendment. The reason I put forth such an amendment to Job Corps was that I am absolutely persuaded that youngsters make up their minds to drop out when they are 12 and 13 and 14 years of age. The youngster who is a dropout at 17 or 18 maybe has been physically present in a classroom because of compulsory school attendance, or has been there at least a few days because of the compulsory school attendance, but for all intents and purposes he has intellectually and emotionally dropped out when he was 12, 13, 14 years old.



You spoke a few minutes ago of the cost-benefit ratio and for the dollar invested you get the most return. Have you given thought to doing something for 14-year-olds on this basis? Again, I can't give you the documentation, but I am persuaded that the cost-benefit ratio for programs for youngsters at 14 years would be much greater than the same amount of money that is invested in an 18- or 19-year-old when the habits are formed, when the motivation has disappeared, et cetera.

It seems to me this is one of the great weaknesses of your total re-organization program: when you indicate just now that you don't have a single thing planned for a 14-year-old. Look at the dropout figures throughout the country.

The number of dropouts at this age is really very startling. I would think if you are really going to do the job you had better include something for these youngsters.

Mr. WEBER. I quite agree with you in principle on that, Mrs. Green. In the proposed Manpower Training Act, although we adhere to a 16-year-old, we have rather broad language which permits the development of programs for persons we are under 16, where estimates of need are made in particular communities.

Mrs. GREEN. Likewise the Job Corps, but you are not doing anything yet about this except to admire or agree with the principle.

Mr. WEBER. We do have some 14- and 15-year-olds in the Job Corps. But, of course, this notion, and in a sense our residential Manpower Center concept—

Mrs. Green. You do have 14- and 15-year olds in the Job Corps?

Mr. WEBER. They are a very small percentage, as I recall. We are planning next year to have a great strengthening of our in-school counseling services through the employment service. However, that is not going to solve the problem. I recognize that.

We are trying to operate within the framework of our responsibilities. But we are asking for an increase in money for counseling, which will permit much wider coverage of schools as many are now denied occupational counseling, because of limitations on resources.

Mrs. GREEN. You stated that you object to this program because it is not tailored to meet the needs of the local community and State; I am rather sympathetic to that criticism. What would be your reaction if you combined it with either the mini centers and residential centers and get these kids away from the big cities for at least a part of their life, or, secondly, that amendment be offered that you have this through a State plan.

You could still, I would think, coordinate a program with Interior and Agriculture so that a program could be developed that would be tailored to the State and local needs.

Wouldn't that take care of your criticism?

Mr. WEBER. I think in developing an employability plan for individual enrollees in the residential manpower centers, they can have in mind this option of taking them out into a new environment. But my own feeling on this, Mrs. Green, is that this should be subordinate to the general goal of developing the skills and aptitudes and social poise which are necessary to move that enrollee into gainful employment.

If, in the judgment of the counselor and the program directors a particular individual would benefit from such services, there is no

reason why we couldn't do it now in terms of moving him to one of our existing conservation centers for a spell.

Mrs. GREEN. At another time I would like to have your views on cutting out certain words in the first paragraph of your testimony, which would establish a Youth Conservation Corps providing short-term employment opportunities, and substituting "provide opportunities for youth within the field of conservation and our natural resources for one summer of their lives."

It seems to me you are getting it mixed up with a conflict in MDTA. As I understand the program which Mr. Meeds and Senator Jackson have proposed, it is not primarily for employment. I would think your testimony would be different.

Let me ask one other question. The program, I believe, sponsored by the Department of Labor here in Washington, with, isn't it Mr. Mayfield?

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Mayfield—the name strikes a responsive chord—I am told, he was the originator of the first cleanup program.

Mrs. GREEN. I don't know whether we are talking about the same program. To be very honest, the thing that stands out in my mind is that Mr. Mayfield was given \$1 million by the Department of Labor for a summer program and the primary job that they did was to kill rats.

Mr. WEBER. There are several persons who have attained visibility through such activities. Mr. Mayfield was originally associated with Pride, Inc. He left that program some time ago.

The Director of Pride is a gentleman called Marion Barry.

Mrs. GREEN. What was the funding for that one program last summer?

Mr. WEBER. I don't think we funded them on a summer basis. They were funded in August of last year, which, of course, took up the period of the previous administration, for a total of \$3 million. I can provide the exact figures for the record. That \$3 million involved a very sizable Neighborhood Youth Corps, out of school component.

Mrs. GREEN. How many youngsters were involved in that?

Mr. WEBER. As I recall, it was approximately 800 to 1,000.

Mrs. GREEN. Could you supply for the record the exact amount and was it a 12-month program. Your recollection is \$3 million for 1 year.

Mr. WEBER. Not just for that program. There were other training components.

Mrs. GREEN. But it involved 800 to 1,000 young people?

Mr. WEBER. That is my understanding. I will get the specific data for you.

(The information referred to follows:)

In August 1968, Pride received a contract for a 13 month program which was then extended to a 15 month program.

It was for \$2.6 million and the funds came from Title 1-B, EOA. However, in October 1968 the U.P.O. awarded Pride an additional 10-month contract, from EOA-NYC funds, in the amount of \$296,000.

This would make the total amount received by Pride to be approximately \$3 million, as stated by Assistant Secretary Weber.

The number of trainees participating during this past year, in both in-school and out-of-school programs were 1300.

The original clean-up program which created Pride was in the spring and summer of 1967. A sum of approximately \$298,000 was provided through MDTA, Sec. 105, for this program and over 1000 youngsters were hired as the "Rat Patrol."



Mrs. GREEN. If the Labor Department gives its blessings to this kind of a thing, where youngsters develop pride in killing rats and cleaning up alleys, it just makes some kind of sense to me that for \$31½ million we could develop some pride in 3,000 youngsters by taking them away from the alleys and the rats for 10 weeks and developing some counseling programs, letting them see the great outdoors and teaching them something about wildlife and conservation.

You know, if you can approve of a pilot program, or whatever you would like to call that program, couldn't you do the other on a pilot basis at least with an equal amount of confidence that it would teach us something.

Mr. WEBER. I guess our judgment on that, Mrs. Green, is that we would be opposed to establishing this as a separate categorical program. We would provide maximum technical support based on the Sierra experiment and our Job Corps experience, to those communities and sponsors, who felt that such an exposure and such an experience would be consistent.

Mrs. GREEN. You have a lot of imagination and ingenuity. Why don't you develop this and incorporate your ideas and not just propose it in principle, because it seems to me it has so much to recommend it. As a matter of fact, it has much more to recommend it than some of these blind alleys that we have wandered through in the last few years.

Mr. WEBER. You know, the real principle we are opposing here, Mrs. Green. We are for conservation, we are for getting kids into wholesome atmospheres, and we are against the establishment of another categorical program.

Mrs. GREEN. Why don't you come up with incorporation, then, of this kind of an idea and this kind of a program that would supplement existing programs not conflict with them. It makes so much sense to me in terms of learning what to do with kids who are now just on the city streets.

Mr. ESCH. Would the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ESCH. I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. What you are really saying is in light of the history of the previous years' experience in developing some programs you might prefer to have the Interior Department administer programs rather than some of the past experiences that we have been through.

Mr. WEBER. I hope I could constructively respond to Mrs. Green's comments. As I see the implications of that, what this means is let's get a model of a program doing what you say is desirable and including what this piece of legislation encompasses, and try to relate it to other objectives.

Everybody is for the outdoors and I think everybody is for helping teenagers get useful skills. We could develop a model, disseminate the model of this program to our Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program sponsors. If you want to move in that direction, we will help you.

Mr. ESCH. Would you agree that in examining the manpower training program that you would be willing to examine how this might fit into the manpower training program as we begin hearings and testimony on this?

MR. WEBER. I think we certainly can. Behind this, as well Congressman Esch, is the whole notion of cost. I think you do have to look squarely at the facts that as a summer program, this is relatively more costly. To the extent that we have a fixed appropriation, it is going to pull down our capacity to launch programs elsewhere.

But we certainly could give communities and prime sponsors the option of whether they want to serve 100 kids in the conventional program or a lesser number with an enriched program.

MRS. GREEN. Compare it with the Pride that you have funded here in terms of the cost, and the results and the long term training or employment possibilities as a result of the training, and compare it with the Blackstone Ranger programs and a few others.

Then let's go from there and see if it doesn't hold greater promise.

MR. WEBER. Of course, the Blackstone Rangers, although they were my neighbors in Chicago, is not a Department of Labor program. It presently is not. I think it is an OEO program.

MR. MEEDS. I think, Mr. Weber, that that is what we are asking for here, a pilot program to evaluate and then expansion if warranted, through the Department of Labor, the Department of Interior, or wherever it will best fit. But we want to see that this type of program is carried out, because we think it will be effective.

When you are talking about NYC programs where the young people are staying at home and are still on the street corners, and where other than disadvantaged children are not involved, you are talking about a totally different concept.

MRS. GREEN. Would you supply for the record at this point in that million slot breakdown the number of slots that you are going to have for young women and young men, and secondly, would you supply the current unemployment rate by young men and young women and would you make it by an age breakdown from 14?

I realize the labor laws, but I would like to have some kind of an idea.

MR. WEBER. The BLS definition of unemployed is 16 and above. But there may be special surveys.

MRS. GREEN. You must have some kind of figures there on the number of dropouts. You could get the dropout figure for the 14-year-olds. They are certainly unemployed and creating a lot of trouble on our streets today.

MR. WEBER. We do know there are 800,000 school dropouts estimated in the disadvantaged categories.

(The information referred to follows:)

BREAKDOWN OF YOUTH UNDER 19 IN TRAINING FISCAL YEAR 1969

Programs	Youth 19 and under	Percent of total	Estimated percent	
			Male	Female
In school.....	125,678	94	52	48
Out of school.....	45,445	61	46	54
CEP.....	46,990	37	58	42
Job Corps.....	41,870	79	71	26
WIN.....	12,800	16	40	60
Institutional.....	21,600	16	55	45
OJT.....	11,900	14	65	35
New careers.....	266	7	28	72
Operation mainstream.....	226	2	79	21
JOBS.....	5,632	11	71	29



In FY 1969 the youths (under 19) were in the programs listed above. This chart shows the number of youths in each program; their percentage of total program slots; the estimated breakdown of male and female participation in training progress. It is anticipated that approximately the same pattern will be followed in FY '70.

Current unemployment rate—September 1969—Youth (14 to 19)

	14 to 19	14 to 15	16 to 19
Male.....	9.8	3.3	11.1
Female.....	13.6	7.4	14.6
Total.....	11.5	5.1	12.7

Note.—The average number of dropouts for October 1966, 1967, and 1968 in the 14 to 15 years of age group—estimated 125,000.

Mr. DANIELS. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Collins.

Mr. COLLINS. I appreciate the opportunity of hearing all of the discussion by the Assistant Secretary. The House is in session and I will defer any questions. Thank you.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you, Mr. Weber.

We had two other witnesses scheduled to testify today, Dr. Leslie Glasgow, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Parks and Marine Resources, Department of the Interior, and Dr. Alfred L. Edwards, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, but unfortunately, time does not permit us to hear your testimony, for which I apologize.

I would like to request you gentlemen to reappear tomorrow morning.

Dr. GLASGOW. I appear as a witness before another committee tomorrow morning, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DANIELS. Would you prefer then in lieu of testifying to submit your statement for the record and I assure you that it will be brought to the attention of all the members of this subcommittee?

Dr. GLASGOW. Yes; I may submit the testimony for the record, is that correct?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes.

Dr. GLASGOW. Yes; I will be glad to do that.

Mr. DANIELS. I apologize, sir, for not being able to hear you today. I had hoped that in addition to testifying, we might have had the opportunity of submitting some questions to you. If any members of the committee desire to submit questions, I would like to reserve the opportunity for them to do so in writing and then you can furnish your reply.

Dr. GLASGOW. I will be glad to. It has been very educational for me to be here this morning.

Mr. DANIELS. Without objection, your statement will be incorporated in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. LESLIE GLASGOW, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE, PARKS AND MARINE RESOURCES, THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Select Labor Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Department of the Interior and to testify on S. 1076, a bill "To establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture A Youth

Conservation Corps, and for other purposes." I note that H.R. 11145 and H.R. 14260 are similar to S. 1076.

S. 1076 as passed by the Senate, provides for the establishment of the Youth Conservation Corps on a 3-year pilot program. The Corps would be composed of young men and women 14 through 18 years of age. They would be employed for a period not to exceed 90 days in 1 year by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. A preference would be given disadvantaged youth. H.R. 14260 also contains a like preference clause, but H.R. 11145 provides for appointment of Corps members without regard to geographical location or economic status. Their employment would be without regard to Civil Service classification laws or regulations. Members of the Corps would be considered Federal employees only for purposes of the Tort Claims Act, and laws relating to compensation for injuries. Rates, hours, and other conditions of employment would be jointly determined by the two Secretaries, and each would be authorized to make appropriate provisions for transportation, lodging, and subsistence. H.R. 11145 provides for Department of Labor participation in the program, and H.R. 14260 establishes a Youth Conservation Interagency Committee.

On April 21 of this year I appeared before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in opposition to S. 1076. Admittedly, the various amendments have added considerable strength to that bill. However, after carefully considering all three bills, our position has not changed. We are still under restrictive budgetary and personnel allowances and our present priorities dictate that any additional personnel made available must be used in other critical areas.

We believe that the short-term nature of the proposed projects, the fact that youths could not remain over 90 days, would mean constant change and substantially limit the learning experience. Corps members would have to be assigned to the simplest types of activities which would not require continuity. The opportunity to develop a meaningful and useful environmental orientation would be limited. We are concerned that the type of environmental exposure envisioned by the youth conservation program would not be realized under the present bill.

Thank you very much.

Mr. DANIELS. Dr. Edwards, would it be convenient for you to return here tomorrow morning at 9:30?

Dr. EDWARDS. No, sir.

Mr. DANIELS. Then, if you have no objection, we will also incorporate your statement at this point in the record.

Dr. EDWARDS. That will be fine.

(Dr. Edwards' prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF ALFRED L. EDWARDS, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am pleased with this opportunity to present briefly the views of the Department of Agriculture on H.R. 11145 and S. 1076.

Although we are sympathetic with the objectives of involving youth in needed conservation work we recommend that the bills not be enacted.

As presently structured the bills could be interpreted to duplicate or overlap a number of youth programs which are presently authorized and operating. We believe, particularly in view of limited available funds, that the present mix of programs can better meet objectives for our Nation's youth at this time. The proposed Manpower Training Act now pending in Congress would establish a more comprehensive, unified, and flexible manpower program.

We recognize that the important conservation work which would be accomplished under the bills needs to be done. However, we believe there may be more effective ways to do this work with the funds available for these purposes.

I will be glad to answer any questions you may have on the work of the Department of Agriculture related to the objectives of H.R. 11145 and S. 1076.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you. The committee will stand adjourned and reconvene at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the subcommittee recessed to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 23, 1969.)



# TO ESTABLISH A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1969

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The subcommittee met at 9:30 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Lloyd Meeds presiding.

Present: Representatives Meeds, Green, Gaydos, Esch, Dellenback, and Collins.

Staff members present: Daniel H. Krivit, counsel; Sue Nelson, research assistant; Cathy Romano, secretary; and Michael J. Bernstein, minority counsel for education and labor.

Mr. MEEDS. The Select Subcommittee on Labor will be in further session for the consideration of the bills H.R. 11145 and S. 1720. The first witness this morning is Mr. Louis Clapper, who is the representative of the National Wildlife Federation.

Mr. Clapper, I read your testimony in the Senate hearings and I was very impressed with it. We are very fortunate to have you with us this morning. You may read your prepared statement or you may insert it in the record and testify from it in any way you choose.

## STATEMENT OF LOUIS CLAPPER ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. CLAPPER. Thank you, sir. I am just recuperating from a case of bronchitis and I hope my voice holds up. The identity of my organization is here. We are a private organization which seeks to attain conservation goals through educational means and we have affiliates in 49 States which are made up of local groups and individuals and all together we think there are some 21½ million supporters of the National Wildlife Federation.

We are pleased and honored that you have invited us to appear today to present our views on the Youth Conservation Corps as would be established by either of these two bills.

From the time our organization was first formed the National Wildlife Federation has been interested and concerned about conservation education and the futures of young Americans.

We believe a youth conservation corps such as would be established by S. 1076 or H.R. 11145 can have widespread benefits for a country beset by a growing population and youth-oriented disturbance.

Some of these benefits are of this type and other benefits are not of this type, but must be judged as intangibles. For the purpose of providing background information I should point out that the National

Wildlife Federation supported the old Civilian Conservation Corps, the depression-born agency which resulted in the creation of many of the present day State parks and forests, wildlife refuges and fishing lakes. This corps also resulted in the training of many national leaders, including some Members of the Congress.

The late Ernest F. Swift, former executive director of our organization, wrote of the CCC with a nostalgic fondness and a copy of his article, which appeared in the April-May issue of National Wildlife magazine, is attached.

Portions of this original program were incorporated into the present day Job Corps as related to the Conservation Camp projects. We are confident that this same procedure can work well, with the variations recommended by S. 1076 and H.R. 11145.

This bill relates the project to younger persons, of both sexes, between the ages of 14 and 19 who would be employed for summer periods of not more than 90 days.

1. Young people participating in the program would be kept out of trouble during the summer periods, with their energies channeled into useful activities—an effort of value to the public.

2. Activities of the corps would be directed to the construction or maintenance of facilities such as trails, water control structures, campgrounds and lakes plus work in forest reseedling, fire control, wildlife management, etc.

In this manner the general public will benefit from the accomplishment of a part of the huge backlog of work that needs completion.

3. Perhaps the greatest benefits, however, would be realized by the young people who participate and not primarily from any wages they might earn. For residents of an inner city or suburb, a summer spent in a national park or forest or wildlife refuge could be the most broadening experience of their lives.

Urbanologists say that the only birds which some of these youngsters have ever seen are pigeons or starlings, the only wild animals they know are rats and mice, the only streams they ever have seen are heavily polluted with human offal and industrial wastes.

All of the participants, regardless of their origin, however, can gain a new appreciation of the basic resources and values upon which this Nation's strength and wealth are based. Pride in their country should be stimulated. They also would learn to be independent and have an opportunity to develop working methods and attitudes which would remain with them as adults in colleges or in the general business community.

One unique thing about this proposal is that it will not be limited to any particular economic, social, or racial background, and we agree to the principle in S. 1076 which gives a preference to disadvantaged youth.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to inject one personal note. My eldest son turned 18 in the spring of 1968. Having applied early, he was fortunate enough to land a summer job in a forest in Colorado.

He made the trip out and back by himself. He performed recreation area garbage cleanup, marked trees, repaired trails, and even performed a bit of firefighting. On one weekend, he visited the ranch of a Spanish-American coworker and helped brand calves.



All of these were first-time experiences he shall never forget. These things, we hope and trust, will help him as he enters military service, probably next month.

It is our understanding that the Department of the Interior each year has applications for summer jobs which run into the tens of thousands and this indicates the widespread interest in this type of program.

There are two essential differences between Senate-passed S. 1076 and H.R. 11145. They are:

1. S. 1076 would have the program administered by the Department of Agriculture, whereas H.R. 11145 specifies the Department of Labor. If the program is to be conducted on national forests, national parks and wildlife refuges, it appears logical that it be administered by the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior rather than Labor.

2. S. 1076 envisions a pilot program and authorizes \$3,500,000 annually for it. H.R. 11145 has no such restriction and we agree with the latter approach. Limitations can be made through appropriations.

In conclusion, we agree with the principle then set out in S. 1076 and H.R. 11145 and hope the committee will see fit to issue a favorable report on it.

Thank you again for the opportunity of making these remarks.

I would like to stress that we don't believe this should be limited to any particular economic level, social or economic or racial background.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Mr. Clapper, for your very fine testimony. I don't wish to be placed in a position of speaking against my own bill but you point out on page 4 of your testimony that S. 1076 envisions a pilot program and H.R. 11145 has no such restriction and you favor the latter.

You should know that both Congressman Wyatt and I introduced this bill early and after it passed the Senate the change was made in S. 1076 to make it a pilot program.

Since that time I am convinced personally that it should be a pilot program because I think while there are some models of this type, none are exactly what we envision.

They are either shorter, as I think the next witness will point out with the program he has supervised, or they are strictly for disadvantaged youth. It is my own feeling that perhaps we should have a pilot program on this, maybe 3 years is too long, maybe we will know by then. Would you address yourself to the question of pilot programs?

Mr. CLAPPER. I think we would be in agreement that a pilot program would be desirable and certainly in this economic atmosphere that exists at the present time.

What I meant there was that it need not be limited necessarily to the 3,000 youngsters envisioned by S. 1076. It could be 2,000 or 5,000 or something of this sort. It would give more flexibility if you had an indefinite amount of money appropriated for it.

I think this would be one of the most important advantages for this bill—to set up a pilot program that, perhaps when the economic situation can allow for more consideration of a wider scope program, we would have the basic background ready and the mechanics set up ready to work with this.

Our organization, this coming summer, is planning to hold for the first time a youth program of our own. We now are in the throes of setting up all the mechanics that are necessary, the logistics of setting up the food and shelter and all the many things that have to be done.

It is no small task to be able to do this properly. I think a pilot program of this sort would be very materially beneficial in this respect.

Mr. MEEDS. I am also struck by what you picked up on page 3 when you say one thing about this proposal is that we will not be limited to any particular economic social or racial background, we agree with the principle in 1076 which gives a preference to disadvantaged youth.

I don't know if you were present yesterday when the Labor Department people testified.

Mr. CLAPPER. No; I was not.

Mr. MEEDS. I think the testimony points out clearly that no agency of the Federal Government at this time has legislation which would authorize the type of program envisioned here and which you so properly point out is unique in that it does not require that it be disadvantaged children only.

It seems to me that this is a great opportunity for us to do some special experimentation, if you want to call it that, with a mix where the disadvantaged can benefit from their participation with those of more disadvantaged backgrounds and vice versa.

Would you like to comment on that?

Mr. CLAPPER. I would be in complete agreement with that. We think this mix you refer to would be most beneficial. I think this is where many of your leaders are going to come from—from some of these young folks in this age area.

If you can indoctrinate them and interest them in this type of conservation activity at this point then you are training some future leaders for more responsible positions when they become adults.

Certainly this mix, this opportunity to meet with each other, I think this mix you refer to would be most beneficial. I think this is for my son was one of the principal benefits—where he got to work with the Mexican workers and people he had never even seen before, I suppose, except in films, or something of this sort, and it gave him a real opportunity to be on his own and to learn to meet people and get along with them.

Mr. MEEDS. Did it change any stereotyped opinions he might have had about those groups?

Mr. CLAPPER. I think it did among that group. I am not sure he had any coworkers among the blacks. You can't spend the weekend as a guest at their home without getting better acquainted with them.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you.

The gentlelady from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I enjoyed your very persuasive arguments in favor of this type of legislation which I wholeheartedly support for many of the reasons which you put forth.

I would like to continue briefly on Congressman Meeds' question with regard to the disadvantaged. If I understand your prepared statement, you would prefer a bill which gives preference to disadvantaged; is that right?

Mr. CLAPPER. Not necessarily prefer, but we would certainly like to have that economic level represented in an overall program.



Mrs. GREEN. How would you define disadvantaged?

Mr. CLAPPER. Economically.

Mrs. GREEN. Isn't this the very reason that wording should not appear in the bill? There are so many other kinds of disadvantaged and it seems to me there are so many youngsters who would benefit from the experience of spending a summer in this fashion that we can't set up the criteria that a youngster is economically disadvantaged.

Mr. CLAPPER. We would be very happy if you would like to take that section out and leave this at the discretion of the administering agency.

Mrs. GREEN. Did I understand you correctly that you would prefer legislation that had an indefinite amount of money?

Mr. CLAPPER. And only because it would give you restrictions that we thought perhaps need not legally exist. You would be pinned down to the maximum of \$31½ million and it could perhaps need \$4 or \$5 million or even less to get the program started on a good basis that would provide the information and background needed to expand the program in the future.

Mrs. GREEN. I think I agree with Mr. Meeds, the author of the House bill, that we should start out with a pilot project. I think that is one of the very sad mistakes that was made in several of the war-on-poverty programs where you just jumped in without any experience.

Mr. CLAPPER. We did not mean to expand it to the point of having a very large project.

Mrs. GREEN. Beyond that I think there is a political necessity of putting in a dollar amount. I don't think we could get it through the House if we put in an indefinite amount.

It has to be there. Thank you very much Mr. Clapper.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Mr. Clapper.

(The document referred to follows:)

#### STRAIGHT TALK

(By Ernest F. Swift)

The CCC camps of the '30's—The Civilian Conservation Corps—are now but a nostalgic memory to many staid businessmen who as boys eagerly enlisted to invade the forest, plains, farmlands and mountains as living symbols of one of our greatest conservation movements.

The CCC camps were one answer to the worst depression and the worst drought that ever befell this nation. When the depression hit in the late '20's, people lost their businesses, factories and jobs, the banks closed, there were bread lines and suicides.

In great part the CCC camps were a social experiment and a morale builder to overcome the nation's fear of fear. In the matter of weeks three million idle and bewildered boys from Brooklyn to Podunk were put to work shoring up the nation's natural resources. The job was three edged: to build confidence and character, to bring financial aid to their distressed families, to start a gigantic natural resources restoration program.

And so the job was begun. Fuzzy cheeked kids in blue fatigues, their first square meal in months under their belts, were hiking out to their assignments with axes, shovels and picks. They did range rehabilitation work, improved wells and springs, built corrals and fences, stock trails and roads, filled in eroded gullies; they worked on federal and state forests and parks, gathered fish spawn, built hatcheries, and some tried their hand at masonry and carpentry. By the sweat of their collective brows these future voters proved among other points that forest fires could be stopped. Three million boys working and playing, breathing the pure, sweet air of a Great America, and learning to swagger in the fierce joy of accomplishment and coming manhood. Thousands of youngsters who commenced as enlistees grew up as doctors, lawyers, engineers and professional conservationists.

The CCC lit a beacon throughout the nation that is still burning; they were a milestone in the nation's history both as a social experiment and in the development of a national conservation conscience. Their lasting accomplishments preceded the present Job Corps program.

The recruitment for the Job Corps does not compare in numbers with the old CCC camps but then the situation is completely different today. Also, their living conditions are far more plush, they lack the military discipline of the old camps and the training is more sophisticated with the emphasis on resources being generally secondary. Having observed several of the Job Corps camps from their inception it is my hope that they can equal the old CCC camps as character builders where boys sweated, learned, were disciplined, developed a fine sense of esprit de corps and a new sense of values.

Mr. CLAPPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEEDS. Our next witness is Mr. John Dolstad who has been director for 11 years of the student conservation program in the Olympic National Park, who is Director of Outdoor Recreation for the Seattle school system, a member of the Conservation Committee of the Seattle Mountaineers and the Olympic Park Association and the North Cascades Conservation Council and he has been involved in the type of program to which we are addressing ourselves, now, for I think, longer than 12 years.

I might say that I also read your testimony in the Senate hearings and was tremendously impressed with the experience you have had in this field and with the plan that you are carrying on for furthering this type of program.

Particularly I am impressed with one of the statements wherein you said that you might be working yourself out of a job, but you agreed to come back here and testify on this legislation because you felt so strongly about it.

We are pleased to have you with the committee this morning.

#### **STATEMENT OF JOHN DOLSTAD, SUPERVISOR, OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASH.**

Mr. DOLSTAD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Jack Dolstad. I am presently on leave as an administrator for Seattle School District No. 1 and have been a teacher and counselor in the Seattle schools since 1951. For the past 12 years my wife and I have operated the student conservation program in Olympic National Park.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I commend you for your insight by combining two major problem areas in the natural resource field into one bill.

That is, how to improve Federal lands by using the untapped potential of restless American youth. As you so well know, the most significant improvement in Federal lands occurred during the 9 years of the CCC.

In Olympic National Park no significant improvements to back-country travel have been made since. Some of the CCC trails have not even been reopened, much less maintained.

I might just add here that there are some 600 miles of trail in the Olympic National Park and the park staff has never been able to really open all of that trail, much less maintain it.

Now that our parks are subjected to the most intensive use in history, it seems most unwise to place budgetary limitations on the existing staffs unless serious thought is given to closing some of the more



famous areas. The world situation forcing these limited appropriations may be the necessary spark for Congress to again continue its efforts to establish a YCC which should provide manpower at less expense to the Government.

The aims of the YCC (H.R. 11145) and the student conservation program we have operated for the past 12 years are essentially the same:

1. To assist the National Park Service and other agencies by having students do work that otherwise could not be done.
2. To benefit the students by offering them a program of conservation education through field experience.
3. To re-create reverence for the land, its wildlife and its space.

In the current bill the appeal to youth differs from the SCA in lowering the participating age to 14 rather than 16 and making a salary available.

In SCA programs applications are mailed nationwide to all who request the forms, but publicity has been limited to protect too many disappointed young people who wish to volunteer.

The working period, although shorter (3 weeks as compared to 90 days), was scheduled during the busy summer when the park is under the strain of peak visitor use.

Even some of the projects suggested in H.R. 11145 have been accomplished by the SCA in national park lands.

Conservation education is also an integral part of the SCA program. Since the proposed bill is so similar to the SCA programs, a brief review of the SCA would seem appropriate.

In developing the idea for the SCA program, six basic questions were asked:

1. Was a Federal agency interested in having such a program both in top administration and in the field?
2. Were young people really interested in volunteering their services or was this wishful thinking by the older generation?
3. Were competent supervisors interested and were they available?
4. Could adequate funding be secured from private sources?
5. Could these young people produce, and was it safe to turn them loose with hazardous tools in remote roadless areas?
6. Would knowledgeable speakers support the SCA program by traveling long distances to talk with students?

The first four questions were answered positively before the start of the program in 1957. The last two questions were affirmed during the first program.

However, the first 1957 program proved to have limited success in Olympic National Park. Far too much time was spent by the park staff in administering the program. The superintendent stated "that using the ranger force to supervise the program work substantially interfered with their regular work program during the park's busy season."

Fortunately, both the participants and sponsors considered the program a success.

To overcome the objections expressed by the Park Service a job and camp supervisor were hired for the 1958 season. Starting with the 1958 summer season the SCA has enjoyed complete endorsement and outstanding success by all who have been involved with the program: The

Federal Agencies, the Student Conservation Association, Inc., the Supervisors, and the participants.

Superintendent Daniel B. Beard of Olympic National Park wrote:

We are all agreed that the work accomplished was worthwhile in every respect. Supervision was good, and the quality of work was as good as was done by regular park crews.

We recognize that the students were assigned to work that was relatively non-technical in nature. It would have cost the government approximately \$8000 to have accomplished the same amount of work.

This estimate is, if anything, rather low. The work at the Humes Ranch has stimulated a discussion on the preservation of pioneer homesteads in the park to such an extent that we have requested a research program to evaluate these homesteads with the thought in mind that the government should preserve the physical remains as well as the culture of these early pioneers somewhat as has been done at the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

It seems very doubtful if this would have been considered if the Humes Ranch restoration program had not been accomplished by the group.

The Park staff was not inconvenienced in any way by the presence of the students this year. I think you will be interested in knowing that I did not tell anyone to do anything specific in relation to the group but left all members of the staff to use their own discretion and initiative in accordance with their interests.

Those who assisted by talks or in any way did so without any direct or indirect orders from me, I do not know of any instance wherein a member of the Park Staff neglected any other of his activities to give attention to your program.

As mentioned to you in conversations we are indeed interested in having the program back next summer approximately on the same basis as this year (1958).

For the record I will just quote one participant, Mike Collins, 1963, who was just killed in Vietnam.

I think the program is very worthwhile and should be continued. It provides experience, enjoyment and employment for deserving students. I hope that it could be expanded (perhaps with federal aid) to include more students and areas. It would also be worthwhile if someday it could include some less fortunate students who lack any kind of job opportunities because of circumstances, etc.

I believe the ideal program would include several levels from a comprehensive educational level as a springboard for those interested in NPS as a career to a kind of CCC for unemployed teenagers.

Why is such a program a success?

1. The majority of the young people of this Nation want to lead positive, constructive lives. An opportunity to be useful is what they ask.

There are presently too few opportunities for employment for this age group.

2. The participants were given recognition and the feeling of being wanted by the park staff.

3. A variety of work was planned with a shorter daily working period.

Younger people have shorter attention spans, and are physically less able to work longer hours. The SCA has never had a serious accident or injury on the job in its 13-year history.

4. Knowledgeable speakers were located and were willing to work with this age group.

5. Supervisors were available from the Nation's teaching corps.

6. The groups were kept small—maximum of 16 participants to two supervisors with a narrow age limit, 16–18. The 14–15 year old has much different interests than the more sophisticated 16 and 17 year old.



One suggestion for your consideration would be to have groups designated to camps according to age and sex.

Even after 13 years the SCA still has one very severe problem area, funding, which limits the program to less than 150 positions. Over 1,500 applications were sent to candidates this year.

The costs of the SCA program have been minimal in terms of accomplishments, notwithstanding the values gained by our youth.

In Olympic National Park the Park Service received over 5,000 hours per year of dedicated volunteer work. My wife and I, not to mention the Park Service, are constantly amazed at the amount of work this age group can accomplish.

Even more astonishing the participants want to work hard.

The enactment of H.R. 11145 will provide a greater number of young people the opportunity to participate constructively for the improvement of the Nation's land.

Since the SCA has of necessity limited itself to volunteers, a concerned group of Seattle outdoor enthusiasts Jim Whittaker, Palmer Smith, Nick Fahey, and central area leaders, Charles Huey, John Little, drafted a proposal similar to H.R. 11145 for the 13 to 15 year olds from the central area of Seattle.

We were concerned that ghetto youth are likely to spend their entire lives within the confines of a large city, and would never be aware of the natural areas that are supposedly available to every U.S. citizen.

The initial trial program involved 100 students for a period of 6 weeks. At the end of the 6 weeks they were paid \$150 for the work projects in Olympic National Park. Even though most of the students had no prior outdoor experience, the program was a success.

I might add here, all the black counselors also had no outdoor experience. So we had two black counselors with the two white counselors who were training not only the 13 to 15 years olds but also the 20 to 21 year olds.

Experimenting with the idea in H.R. 11145 of using girls as well as boys, the Student Conservation Association, Inc., operated for the first time two girls' programs to see if they would be as effective as the boys' programs have been over the last 11 years.

The girls did an outstanding job and were successful in completing park projects and living in the wilderness setting. In Olympic National Park this last summer we tried mixing boys and girls, 17 boys and five girls. We anticipated that there might be some problems with a mixed group in the wilderness, but found much to our surprise and delight that our fears were unfounded.

Gentlemen, I came to this hearing today from Seattle to strongly support H.R. 11145 even though the SCA-incorporated student groups might be eliminated when this bill becomes law unless some provision was made to allow Federal agencies to contract on a financial matching basis for services with organizations such as ours.

I do this because after 12 years of working with this age group in Olympic National Park I know that more young people deserve the opportunity to experience an SCA-type program.

I might add that of the 1,500 applications I would say approximately 1,450 were most acceptable young people wanting to volunteer their services. Most unfortunately, we could not place them.

I think this is a tragedy for our society, for as the progress of civilization limits the experience of the basic conditions of nature in

everyday life, it is increasingly important for the young to know personally what wilderness has to teach.

Our modern mechanisms give us mastery of our environment and a false sense of sufficiency regarding it. Without their gadgets and away from television sets, the youth come to realize man's dependence on the whole community of life.

Paradoxically, they also become more independent as individuals, even to the extent of travel by foot. In wilderness, the pace of life is slower and people can relate as individuals to each other.

It is amazing to see a 200-pound six-footer afraid that he can't make it up a mountain or across a foot bridge or on a long cross-country hike. We thought they were kidding us but they were not:

I believe H.R. 11145 and S. 1076 are so important because they specify involvement by all young people, boys and girls with diverse backgrounds.

The young people were educated by their very participation in the program and with the aid of resource speakers. The lessons of wilderness include: the timelessness of life, the appreciation of life in past ages, the benefits of recreation to individuals, and the acquisition of knowledge by direct observation.

In particular they learned about the specific park in which the program was located. They learned the physical skills of using tools and the personality skill of working effectively. They learned basic conservation principles and attitudes by which to form judgments of value for the rest of their lives.

My wife and I want to see a greater number of young people deposit their time and energy in the bank of the future.

With your permission, at this time I would like to show some cuttings made by Mr. Louis Kirk, a former park service naturalist, and now working in the Tacoma area of our program in action in Olympic National Park with the boys and at Mt. Rainier National Park with the girls.

Mr. MEEDS. We will have the lights out and the camera moving. (Film showing; commentary)

Mr. DOLSTAD. This is a building the boys built in 16 days this summer. It is 18 feet wide, 30 feet long; the ridge poles are all about 30 feet in length and about 12 inches in diameter.

The boys learned what the early pioneers learned, how to use native materials. They could not bring to this area any dimensional lumber. You might think this is hardly conservation, building buildings, but the park service needs maintenance facilities.

We actually live under plastic in the summer months. We are 17 miles by trail up the Elwha River in Olympic National Park in the State of Washington. There is excellent fishing.

This is the Elwha River and when you have girls along, the boys always seem to want to go for a swim about midday.

I notice a change in the boys' language and a change in their dress.

We have quite a bit of wildlife around. One of the girls went down by the river one day and thought it was one of the other girls that was with her, but it was a bear.

We have to transport everything in usually by horse. The park helps us pack in the supplies and we are in base camp for at least 2 weeks before we move out of the area.



We take an FM park radio with us in case someone is hurt. We always plan for safety. I think a program like this will not function very long or effectively if someone was seriously injured.

One of the reasons that they have to be volunteers is that they are under 18 years of age, and are not allowed to be employed by the Federal Government.

Many people in our society think young people should not handle dangerous tools.

I think if properly trained they are probably a little more careful than the older people who get too familiar with tools and are not careful.

We did have one airdrop, they forgot to bring in the sink, and a few other plumbing supplies. We were able to contact them by radio so we could finish and complete the building.

We always use downed logs when we can. This is a western red-cedar and this is a shake bolt. Not too many people are familiar with this type of construction.

This is the Hayes River, right next to Elwha. The boys go fishing for the shake bolts. If you will notice, one boy is a little more steady than the other. Usually the bolts floated around the corner and the boys did not have to go in the water for them. It is snow-water and rather cold, about 36 degrees. Then they use a tool which I saw in the museum of history and industry called a frow for making shakes.

This is the way they get all the shake material for their roof. We have our own pack animals where we pack the shakes about a mile to the building site.

Then you soak the shakes before you bring them into the landing and put them on the building. The boys learned to work with pack animals, learned how to do all the things that the early pioneers did, how to use pioneer tools.

It gives the participants a historical perspective.

The building that was there before had been there since 1936 as a temporary building and had collapsed. The Park Service wanted it taken down and a new building put up.

This is our donkey Zorro that we have had for 12 years on the program. When our children were very young he used to pack them instead of shakes.

This is the ridgepole for the building. The boys were proud of the building. It took this group of boys 16 days in total to completely build this structure. It has six windows and heavy shakes, much heavier shakes than you would normally expect on a building of this type. It should last for 100 years as a Park Service ranger station.

We have special packs built for our donkey because he should not carry such a heavy load.

We took the boys on a field trip on this particular day up from the Hayes River on the Elwha to Hayden Pass, a distance of 8 miles. They took along their digging tools and also the former park naturalist came along to give them a talk on the high country before they actually went into it.

You never know in the Olympics what the weather will be and if you have a good day you try to get up in the high country with the boys. The trail was really not safe for horse travel. There was an Olympic marmot—they were fixing the bad spots in the trail.

This picture was taken more for ease to the photographer. Usually you would not have boys working this close together but he wanted a picture of them working together and moving together. They all work hard, very much harder than most people realize, much harder than most adults.

Now we shift to the girls' program at Mount Rainier. This is the first year we tried the girls' program. This is the night after a heavy rain and they are starting to air things out in the sunshine.

The participants in the student conservation program are selected by application from all over the United States.

Our hardest job actually is the selection of applicants and usually the ones that come in early are the ones that are selected.

The girls were replanting an overused former meadow campground.

The Park Service has never had the opportunity to replant the area. The girls not only replanted the area, they also put up a fence so that park visitors would give the fragile meadow a chance to grow back.

If you go back to Mowich Lake at Mount Rainier National Park in the State of Washington you will see the work they accomplished.

I did spend a year in Finland in 1964 and 1965 and I am personally convinced that girls can do almost anything that boys can do if we give them a chance. We overprotect them in our society.

It might take two girls rather than one boy on some jobs but they can do it. The girls are also using western red cedar. They are not making a horse fence. The fence is for wandering people. This girl is from Connecticut and I would venture a guess that she will probably be back to this park some day.

In both Rainier and Olympic National Parks there is snow the year around so for many of the young people who come from the southeast and don't have much opportunity to play in the snow this is an exciting adventure for them.

Here they were up in the high country making rock cairns. In late August you don't need a rock cairn. But about 2 weeks earlier visitors need cairns to follow the trails. Cairns keeps visitors from being lost across these mountain meadows.

We try in our program to have the best possible speakers come to visit us since it is usually a long distance from the road end, especially in my program, and a long distance from the urban center.

There are girls from Washington, New York, California, Connecticut. I have always been amazed myself, watching these young people together, how they work together in the group.

That was author Ruth Kirk who has written extensively on the Olympic and Rainier.

I thank you very much.

Mr. MEEDS. I wish to compliment you for some very enlightening and obviously dedicated testimony. Allow me to ask some questions about the cost of your program.

I understand there are different types of programs here. So let's go first with the program you had at Olympic National Park where I understand you had about 30 people?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Right, in our Olympic National Park programs. In 1958 the approximate cost was \$250 per student for a 3-week program.

Mr. MEEDS. As you know, this bill contemplates a 90-day program.

Mr. DOLSTAD. Right.



Mr. MEEDS. Would you give us the benefit of your experience discussing the difference between a 3-week program and a 90-day program?

Would our program be too long in this bill or not long enough?

Mr. DOLSTAD. I think it would depend on the young people and the park.

Olympic National Park is a very wet area, therefore, a shorter period of time might be preferable.

One of the reasons we run a 3-week program is we want to expose more young people to the concepts of conservation and wilderness living and love of this park.

So if we take 2-3-week program we expose twice as many young people. If you put fewer young people on for 90 days you would limit the number of participants. It seems to me in our society that more young people should have the opportunity to work on the Federal lands and by doing it over short, intense periods there, their interest level would remain very high the entire time.

The fact is in our program they leave not wanting to leave. They still are real excited about staying there. I think if you have too long a program they may have a downward turn after a number of weeks.

This summer with central area youth who had never been out in the park, we tried a 6-weeks period. We tried to overcome a lack of enthusiasm by moving their location each week and by giving them a \$150 grant at the end of 6 weeks.

If they did not stay they did not get the grant.

Mr. MEEDS. How much did that program cost? I saw a cost breakdown in the Senate report.

Mr. DOLSTAD. It was a little bit over double the cost of our own program but in fairness to the one central area program, we were not only establishing the program for the 13- to 15-year-old young person, we were training black counselors, so half of the counseling staff was being trained and to train two black counselors we needed the white counselors with them. We needed a smaller ratio of participants to counselors.

In our program there were two supervisors. In the Central Area Wilderness program there were four supervisors for 16 young people plus a site director.

Mr. MEEDS. You spent \$166,000 roughly for 300 children?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Actually when they finally came to the limiting factor it was down to 100 young people and near \$70,000.

Mr. MEEDS. So you approximately hit your goal?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Right.

Mr. MEEDS. And that included \$150?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Right; that included the \$150 stipend to the young people.

Mr. MEEDS. Now you point out a difference in the age factor. As you are aware, this bill would go to ages 14 to 18. Would you suggest that there be a separation in the age group, maybe 17 and 18, and 14 and 15?

Mr. DOLSTAD. If you run a small program I would think so. The girls are more mature at 14 and 15 than the boys. In the boys' group I noticed the 15-year-old really did not relate too well to the 17-year-old. He did not have the same desires, the same philosophy. He was not as knowledgeable about what went on in the world and he also wore out a little

faster. He would try to keep up, he made every effort to do what the 17-year-olds do and physically he could not do it.

We have only had a few 15-year-olds in our program and except for one I would say that they were a little young at 15 to go along with the 17-year-olds.

They just don't have quite the stamina, they are not as well developed.

Mr. MEEDS. I noticed in the pictures something that seems to be tremendously important about this whole concept, these people were doing meaningful work.

In other words, this was work that needed to be done and it was work that would contribute to other people's enjoyment and to the enhancement of the outdoors.

It seems to me essential that our young people today be given participation in something which is meaningful, not just picking up paper on the street corners and in the parks, not that that is unnecessary, but I think the young people want to get out and do something that they can see blossom before their eyes, so to speak.

I was particularly interested in the type of work that the people now in your programs were doing, the trail work, building that cabin.

Would you suggest that the work that be done be this type of work, meaningful work?

Mr. DOLSTAD. You can't fool young people. If you give them make-work the program would fail.

It has to be purposeful work that they understand. Then, they will go ahead and accomplish the task. I think it is better to have an intensive program rather than one where the truck might not arrive or the work is not there to do.

Older people can relax better and sit around, but young people want to be busy, they don't want to sit waiting for something to happen. Furthermore I think it teaches them bad habits.

They want to be active. They want to work hard. I have seen this for 12 years.

Mr. MEEDS. Just one more question, how do you fund your program?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Our program is funded almost entirely by private donations from garden clubs, from interested individuals, conservation organizations, some funds are coming from national foundations and this last year the Department of the Interior, National Park Service was able to help us to some extent.

Mr. MEEDS. Do you ever get hit with this question when you are soliciting funds—for instance, if you were to come to me and ask for funds it would seem to me to be a natural reaction on my part to say where is this money going to be used and you are going to tell me in Olympic National Park or in the National Forests and at about that point in time I am going to say why isn't the Federal Government doing this?

Do you get that kind of response?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Very much so and the answers to the response is that the appropriations are not sufficient for this type of activity, that usually the Park Service is cut back first. They can and have deferred maintenance projects.

The relatively small number of hikers that go up the trails manage to get through, they can go over logs, and under logs.

The other thing that I would like to add here is that Laurence Rocke-



feller had suggested in communications with the Department of the Interior that he was very much for this type of program but thought that the Federal Government should do more in sharing the costs.

Our large problem always is we have to run a program based on the funds available and we have no one large donor or no one large foundation behind us.

We would like to have one.

Mr. MEEDS. I could ask a lot more questions because your testimony is so interesting but I know the gentlelady from Oregon has some questions.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I enjoyed it as well as the pictures, and it made me long to get away from the city we are in right now.

Mr. MEEDS. If the gentlelady will yield just one moment, this is not a set up to show how beautiful the Second Congressional District in Washington is.

Mrs. GREEN. I understood that because it is obvious if that was the purpose you would have chosen the third district of Oregon. But it is very beautiful.

I thought one of the key sentences of your testimony was on page seven. "In wilderness the pace of life is slower and people can become individuals to each other."

Mr. Chairman, I recommend to you and to the chairman of this subcommittee, that these pictures be shown to administration witnesses who are opposed to this kind of a program. I do not understand how anybody could sit and see those pictures and then finance a program for boys to kill rats in the alleys of Washington, D.C. for a summer and be willing to spend \$3 million on that and not for a program like this that would open the eyes and give opportunities to youngsters who have spent all of their lives in the streets of big cities and have no idea of the beauty of the country and what it could offer in the way of individual advancement and satisfaction and so on.

It just seems to me the contrast between the two programs is so tremendous that I would think it would persuade any administration people who are now opposed to it to alter their views.

I have three questions, Mr. Dolstad, if I may, in three areas. On page 7, you express a concern that if we have a Federal program it might eliminate the program which you and Mrs. Dolstad have been so active in and have done such a wonderful job in.

I agree wholeheartedly with what you said. I would like your thinking on some kind of approach that could accomplish your objective and not open the door wide to private agencies that we see in increasing numbers again are entering all kinds of programs in the war on poverty and in the educational field.

Education is the second biggest industry in the country next to the Defense Department these days. We notice that all of the big conglomerates and the big corporations and so on are moving over into the field of education and poverty to take advantage of their profitmaking companies.

How could we accomplish your objective and yet limit it to people who share your commitment to develop the programs for young people?

Mr. DOLSTAD. I don't know that I can very well answer this question. We are a nonprofit tax exempt association.

Mrs. GREEN. So are a lot of the corporations who are making a pretty handsome chunk of money.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I don't know how you can legislate for one nonprofit tax exempt organization such as ours and not open the door to others.

Mrs. GREEN. I am really reluctant to ever again vote for a bill that says the Department can contract with a private agency.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I fully understand this.

Mrs. GREEN. I wonder if we could have wording in it that administrators of this program are encouraged to take advantage of the experience of groups who have, prior to the enactment of this law, been engaged in this kind of activity and to use that as a guide?

I wonder if that would not do it?

Mr. DOLSTAD. I think that might do it because it seems to me we have been a prototype of this type of legislation. We in a sense have been a pilot project. This summer we tried using younger participants and girls.

We did do both of those things this summer because I was curious to see what would happen with younger people and I was curious to see what would happen with girls.

I always have thought that girls were shortchanged in our society. You might be able to include within this legislation an organization such as the SCA, Inc., that had been in the field prior to this legislation so you would not have other organizations jumping in because funds were available.

We have been very closely associated with the National Park Service, and just recently we have included the Forest Service, in our program expansions. Originally, only the Park Service was included, for the SCA was formed to help the National Park Service based on a senior thesis by Liz Cusman, now Mrs. E. C. Titus. Her concept was that the national parks were going to be closed, if help was not provided. She thought that students could provide help for their parks and at the same time learn from this experience in conservation education.

She wrote this thesis in 1954 and 1955. We are somewhat well-established.

I would hope that we would not be eliminated but I can see where there would be a problem if you tried to run a voluntary program of the same young people of the same age along with young people that were being paid.

Mrs. GREEN. I am very much impressed with your approach to this and I am doubly impressed by the fact that your testimony when it was prepared, obviously was with the understanding that there were no women Members of Congress, because in your testimony you treat us all as gentlemen.

So you obviously had not prepared it with the idea of appealing to the women Members.

I hope Mr. Dolstad, and Mr. Chairman, that these pictures are also shown over on the Senate side and while I have the highest regard for your colleague from Washington, Senator Jackson, I have great admiration for him, it seems to me that these pictures would disabuse him of any idea that the girls who would be in it would be for the



purpose of being in the kitchen or at the desks doing clerical work.

I do agree with what you said, that the girls are able to do almost as many things as the boys. You had two programs in which girls were included, how many of the 180 were girls and how many were boys?

Mr. DOLSTAD. This last year there were 58 girl participants.

For your information in our own program the girls had a job, a kitchen or a camp responsibility as well as every boy, every day, and every day they had a job responsibility. They were able to do all the work the boys could do.

Mrs. GREEN. In the recruitment or the selection of people from the States you have, did you run into any problem of reluctance to come on the part of an individual who had never been in the great outdoors?

Mr. DOLSTAD. The participants have some insecurities when they arrive. It is a new experience no matter what you write. It is so different that they can't anticipate. They are a little nervous when they first come and are very quiet.

It is most unusual to see teenagers so quiet. For the first day or two there is hardly any talking to each other or anyone else.

Mrs. GREEN. The reason I asked this is I think it would be desirable to write something into the bill in regard to recruitment. I am reminded of some hearings we had in New York City in the ghetto areas on juvenile delinquency. We were talking about the new version of the CCC and we directed this question to quite a few of the young people: If you had an opportunity to spend the summer in the outside, the outdoors, in our National Parks or Forests, would you be interested or go. In every single case the answer was no, they would not.

Then the question, if you could go with your friends here, if several of you could go together would you go and the answer was then they would be interested. It was either an out and out yes or we would be interested.

This persuaded us that the ones who most needed the experience would be reluctant to make application or want to go if they had to break away from everything that was familiar.

If you could get a group together I think that would be helpful.

Mr. DOLSTAD. In essence that is what we did with the central area group of the 100 young people this summer. We had it set up for 86 but 100 wanted to go so they took all that were willing from the central area of the city of Seattle which is an area of 55,000 to 60,000 predominantly black young people.

I think they had some feeling of security with each other. But the first week out in the wilderness was rather traumatic. It rained the whole first week, and they had never lived under plastic or lived in sleeping bags and they really did not behave toward each other the way they should have.

When one's bag got wet they tried to exchange bags with each other. But after the first week in the wilderness setting they learned they had to live together and work together and they changed dramatically during the second week and some of them after 6 weeks wanted to stay longer.

Of course, they were getting excellent food and living in what to me is the most beautiful place in the world so I can see why they wanted to stay. But even for myself 6 weeks without a hot shower is a wee bit tiresome.

I enjoy 3 weeks fine, but at the end of 3 weeks, I like to go back home and relax for a few days.

Mrs. GREEN. I think you have made a very good point and I think your testimony both by word and picture has been very impressive and very persuasive.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I am very sorry I just had gentlemen in my testimony.

Mr. MEEDS. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLLINS. I was most impressed and I am delighted that you are a witness. You present an interesting and different viewpoint. I am impressed particularly with this private idea where the Government went into it in a minimal position.

In other words basically this is a private situation and in Washington, D.C., today there is kind of an obsession that the Federal Government needs to do everything and should do everything and we have a responsibility to spend money.

Once you leave the District of Columbia the citizens feel like this money which is known as taxes, is being abused.

I come from a metropolitan area and while you were talking I started jotting down groups that we have in our community that have summer camps. We have the Big Brothers, the Salvation Army, the YMCA, and YWCA, we have the Girl and Boy Scouts, and then we have religious group camps and the biggest of all is we have a salesmanship club that has a tremendous camp that really goes all the year. Our money comes out of private donations. Now I wanted to expand on this a little bit.

You named some civic groups. I did not hear you name such groups as the Scouts or you did not name such things as the salesmanship club at home.

The Cowboys every year put on a benefit and when the Cowboys play this game this money goes for this camp and it is a tremendous money-maker. Probably they make \$100,000 a year for this particular project and the city works on it. Do you have any projects like that in Seattle that help you?

Mr. DOLSTAD. No, we don't, because ours is a nationwide program and not local and we do not pick for our program more than one or two from any State. So we would not, as I see it, be able to raise money in this fashion since we are national.

Mr. COLLINS. Do you have religious groups that help you in any way? In other words, today you don't hear much about the subject of tithing but in the old days everybody believed in tithing.

Mr. DOLSTAD. We are limited there because our program strives to have all religious groups possible represented in our program.

Mr. COLLINS. Is this just mail solicitation that brings you money?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Mostly mail solicitation, right.

We have been a small, quality program.

Mr. COLLINS. Do you have funding drives of this type?

I am interested in whether we can finance this situation. I really do believe in summer camps. But the idea of paying children and youngsters to go out and build stronger characters for themselves I cannot understand.

Why should we be paying them a nickel?

Mr. DOLSTAD. The young people do constructive work. There is an Upward Bound program you may have heard of which tries to improve



the individual, improve the self, exposing them to trying conditions. This makes for better character. Our program does the same thing, only our main thrust is in giving service to society by doing constructive work and through the constructive work the individual improves. He knows he is doing something of value.

If we did not have constructive work to do I believe that our program would be very limited. But I know they accomplish so much in such a short period of time of meaningful work. For instance—this cabin they built this summer in 16 days should last 100 years or longer, for it is very well constructed.

Mr. COLLINS. That was most impressive because they felt like they did it, they were all part of a team?

Mr. DOLSTAD. And they must do it. I should not do it, the Park Service should not do it, these young people must have that sense of accomplishment if it is to have any real meaning to them.

Mr. COLLINS. Is it necessary to pay these campers?

Mr. DOLSTAD. We call them participants. I don't think of them as campers at all in the normal sense of camping. I think of them as actual volunteer employees doing constructive work.

Mr. COLLINS. Is there any necessity at all to pay them 1 nickel of salary?

Mr. DOLSTAD. One of the problems we have been faced with in the first years of our program was that kids coming from the east coast in particular, either they or their families, had to sacrifice to send them all the way out to the State of Washington to Olympic National Park. I would say the minimum cost must have run close to \$200 that they had to take out of their pockets to come and do constructive work for society.

It seems to me we should have a system where any young person who wants to volunteer his services should have at least a travel allowances when need is shown.

We do have a travel allowance now so that a participant can come from anywhere in the United States who can demonstrate the need for financial help.

Mr. COLLINS. Is there any need to bring people from New York to Washington?

Mr. DOLSTAD. I think if you have a program in New York area that is fine, but after all a national park is for all the people of society. I think it is important for young people in New York, and so forth, the leaders of tomorrow, to know how wonderful a place like Olympic National Park is so that there is not some sort of congressional action at some future time that might delete land in that park.

These young people would be your strongest conservationists; they would know the area. I think all people in this society should have this strong commitment to protecting their national lands. Quite frankly you don't have as much Federal land in the East as there is in the West.

I think you need this broad base of support for your Federal agency.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN. There would be two reasons why I would support your views. One is I think the Job Corps has had the experience of transporting participants across country. It seems to me to have been an awful waste of money and effort and so on.

But in addition to that we have a writer in Oregon called Stewart Holbrook whose main thesis is keep foreigners out of Oregon. As we look at the crowded cities there are more and more Stewart Holbrook followers. So when everybody in the United States sees pictures like this and the beauty of Oregon as well as Washington we would soon be as crowded as New York and the other places.

So you will have my support for both of those reasons against transporting people.

Mr. MEEDS. Will the gentlelady yield?

I am sure the lady will also support what Mr. Dolstad said about camps, if they had these programs in New York State it would not be necessary to send them out to Oregon.

Mr. DOLSTAD. Correct. I think if there is a local area available for a program, local participants will be used. For instance, we have a program in Vermont. That program has participants mostly from the New York and the New England areas. Our Olympic program has been nationwide partly because I happen to believe that the real importance to the young person besides the creative efforts in constructing something is the interaction between young people.

For example, we had participants from Texas and from New York. There is a tremendous amount of interaction that takes place within the group in an intense living situation where they are all together for 3 weeks. It is vital for our society to have people from throughout the Nation gaining an understanding of other regions.

Mr. COLLINS. I want to thank you for your testimony and commend you and your wife for this fine work you are doing. It is splendid.

Mr. MEEDS. I have a few questions.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point that perhaps this could be carried out primarily by private agencies. As I recall your testimony, you had 1,500 applications for one of the programs for which you were able to select how many?

Mr. DOLSTAD. One hundred fifty was our funding limitation.

Mr. MEEDS. I might also note that the unemployed of the country as of last summer by Labor Department statistics in the 16- to 21-year-old age group was 1,436,000, and I am sure it would be higher for younger people. Private charities are now doing this, as is yours; yours is not the only one involved in this type of work. So would it be your impression that private organizations can really take care of the overall problem you are talking about?

Mr. DOLSTAD. I truthfully think not. I would like to take the position that it could be done by private funding. I think if we could go to private individuals and foundations and say, "Look the Federal agencies are so impressed with this program that they are willing to contribute on a matching basis," we would be more able to raise funds because we are working on Federal lands to improve Federal properties.

Lawrence Rockefeller felt that the SCA program had great merit, but he thought the Federal agencies should help financially.

Mr. MEEDS. Upon whom do you think the major responsibility for maintaining the Federal lands—parks, forests, the seashores of this Nation—would fall?

Mr. DOLSTAD. I think it falls on Congress to appropriate sufficient funds for Federal agencies to maintain lands within their jurisdiction.



Mr. MEEDS. It falls on the Federal Government, does it not?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Right.

Mr. MEEDS. Just one last point: I have a strong feeling that in this bill payment of a stipend to these young people is essential and I think you articulate it very well. Doesn't the fact that they are receiving payment for meaningful work give them the type of pride in their own work that is so essential to young people today?

A part of the society and responsibility for maintaining the national lands, isn't that an essential ingredient to the program?

Mr. DOLSTAD. I am not quite so sure on this question because I think the essential ingredient is for young people to have a cause. I think our society has treated teenagers as unproductive youngsters. A 16- or 17-year-old is no longer an immature youngster.

They want to show that they are developing; they want to show they are gaining in maturity. Part of this development may be in getting a full dollar salary, but I think a more important part is to have a justifiable and really a meaningful cause. A New York Times editorial Monday stated this cause; if we can improve the quality of our environment as a society, if young people can think of it as their cause, there is nothing that could help the Nation more.

Man himself may become an endangered species and youth could help to correct society's past environmental errors. I would like to see in the near future more young people involved in an environmental awareness of the importance to our society of the Nation's natural resources.

I believe the proposed legislation makes a start toward such a cause.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentlelady.

Mrs. GREEN. I am not in favor of limiting this program to the disadvantaged children and I am not sure about the stipend, but I would not want the disadvantaged to be barred from the program so certainly their costs and everything ought to be paid.

If the youngster has to earn his money for school next year and therefore is barred from the program because there is no stipend, I think that would be unfortunate.

In the Seattle area did you ever experiment with the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

Mr. DOLSTAD. We did not combine it with the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The NYC worked on another site that was nearer to the center of the city. We did not combine the two. We had almost complete opposition to the wilderness plan that was established except for the assistant superintendent, and superintendent, Dr. Bottomly, who was behind the plan.

Some people suggested that a black child would not enjoy the wilderness.

Mrs. GREEN. Yesterday I mentioned a week's program that is a part of our Portland program where the sixth graders have a week's experience. Have you ever done anything like that in the Seattle schools?

Mr. DOLSTAD. Individual teachers and school principals have done this. There has never really been a position set aside as director of outdoor education. Most large urban centers are very much behind the surrounding suburban areas in establishing fifth and sixth grade outdoor centers or conservation centers.

The large city does not have the transportation facilities and it always has a problem with funding. Most of the central area youngsters in Seattle have not even been to Woodland Park Zoo.

I think it may be catastrophic if our society does not understand man's role in the environment. Many individuals consider asphalt as the basic land cover in the world. This could be fatal to man.

I think we should have more environmental education programs in large urban areas. Most suburban areas have programs.

Mrs. GREEN. I wonder if thought should be given by the staff to perhaps incorporating in one program a 1-week experience for 14- and 15-year-olds and then a longer program maybe for the older ones.

It seems to me that the Portland program has been so successful.

Mr. MEEDS. I think this would not be impossible in terms of the present language, Mrs. Green. If you will notice the language is not more than 90 days.

This thought came to me, too, when he talked about the length of these periods that might be involved. I would hope that we could arrive at language that would provide for the possibility of programs within the 90-day period.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I am very much in favor of any program where you could have youngsters from all segments of our society.

Mr. MEEDS. You might be interested to know that the testimony from the Department of Labor yesterday indicates that one thing they felt was bad about the program was that it was not long enough.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I believe most temporary help are not allowed by Federal statute to work more than 90 days.

Mr. MEEDS. I am sure I speak for all the members of the subcommittee when I express to you our very sincere appreciation and our commendation for very fine testimony.

Mr. DOLSTAD. I wish to thank you for asking me to testify.

Mr. MEEDS. Our next witness is Ray Swanson for the Western Forest Industries Association.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you. I just want to express my appreciation to Mr. Swanson for coming to testify on this bill. We have known him for a long time in the State of Oregon from his involvement in this education and I particularly look forward to his testimony.

Welcome to the committee this morning.

Mr. MEEDS. Do you have any pictures of the Third District of Oregon?

Mr. SWANSON. I am afraid I am not as well prepared as the previous speaker.

#### STATEMENT OF RAYMOND SWANSON, DIRECTOR, WESTERN FOREST INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, my name is Ray Swanson. I live in Eugene, Oreg. I appear today on behalf of Western Forest Industries Association, an association composed of lumber and plywood manufacturers in California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana.

The members of this association are all heavily dependent for their raw material supply upon publicly owned forest lands, including the national forests.



For this reason, we are vitally concerned about the quality and intensity of the management of Federal commercial forest lands.

The association is therefore particularly pleased to have this opportunity to appear in support of the pending measure.

My own interests, experience and background make me grateful to the association for having been chosen as its spokesman today. My father and members of his family were lumber manufacturers. I am a lumber manufacturer. My brothers are lumber manufacturers. For most of my life I have had a vital and continuing interest in forests, good forestry and its utilization.

There is further reason for me to appreciate this opportunity to appear here today. For the past 18 years I have been involved as a layman in the field of public education. I began my career in this area as a member and chairman of the local school board at Noti, Oreg., where my business is located.

Following a concurrent term as president of the Lane County School Boards Association I served for 5 years as chairman of the Lane County School District Reorganization Committee which had the responsibility for developing a plan of organization to provide the best possible opportunity for elementary and secondary education in the county.

I later served as a member and chairman of the Lane County Intermediate Education District and I retired early this year from the Oregon State Board of Education after 4 years as a member and one term as chairman.

While on the State board I was also a member of the Oregon Advisory Council for Vocational Education.

You will understand therefore my gratitude for the privilege of participating on the association's behalf in the development of legislation that is concerned with these two objectives, helping our youth of secondary school age and improving the quality of our land resources and our environment.

Because this bill is aimed at enhancing the growth potential of our youth, I do not believe that the usual cost-benefit ratio furnishes a suitable touchstone to measure the value of this legislation.

It is certainly not without elements that will appeal to the auditor who computes the dollar values, but in a very real sense, this bill calls also for investment in the growth potential of our citizens of youthful age.

The full realization of that growth potential would be nationally productive to a degree, I believe, that is beyond any dollar investment that may be made in implementing this legislation.

Let me give you one concrete example. A good friend of mine arrived in Oregon from New Haven many years ago as a poverty-stricken youth in the Civilian Conservation Corps. He was put to work in the woods and when he finally left the CCC he got a job in a lumber mill, applied the knowledge he had gained and went on to acquire his own business.

Over the years he has prospered greatly. And the investment that the Government made in him he has plowed back. He has been a prominent member of our State legislature. He has been a member of the Oregon State Board of Forestry. He is a member of the small group that brought a modern hospital to his community.

Both as a member of the legislature and as a private citizen he has been conspicuous in his concern for improvement in the education of our youth, and he has made many inconspicuous and anonymous contributions toward the education of young people.

A couple of years ago several hundred people gathered at one of his sawmill operations in an intermountain area to hear an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture pay tribute to the operation.

What had been a pocket of rural poverty had been transformed into a solid, prosperous community. From among unskilled Americans of Spanish descent a labor force had been recruited, trained and developed into an efficient, skilled organization that is well paid and justly proud of itself.

My friend, in short is an asset to the communities where he has lived and where his operations are involved. Exactly what portion of this value was contributed by the CCC program it is impossible to say.

Surely, however, the CCC contributed much. But what is contributed is not susceptible of measurement strictly in the dollar terms of the auditor.

Yet real and constructive values were generated of greater worth I believe than the actual dollars invested by the Nation through the CCC in that man.

I think there is a vital and indisputable need for the kind of service a Youth Conservation Corps can provide in our national parks and other Federal lands.

With an expanding population, there is increasing and irresistible pressure for more productive use of all our land resources. Recreationists want more parks, trails, and wildernesses.

Stockmen want more productive rangeland. Lumbermen want more timber that can come only from more intensive management. There is great public demand for better environmental quality. Many of these objectives can be enhanced and achieved through this type of program.

Existing recreation areas can be maintained and improved through the removal of debris from streams and park areas while at the same time providing wood for campfires and the construction of rustic furniture.

Artistic youth can work with rocks, plants, and other natural materials to make trails, streams, and roadside areas more attractive.

Rangeland can be prepared for seeding and water storage areas could be developed for cattle and wildlife. Logged off area could be cleaned of debris and made more productive with a substantial reduction in air and stream pollution.

At the same time efforts might be made to utilize the materials gathered at these sites. Immediate natural reforestation can and would be enhanced by the removal of these materials—something that at the present time is economically impractical.

The presence of properly supervised active youth could insure greater protection from devastating rangeland and forest fires that seem to occur each summer in spite of increasing efforts at fire prevention and suppression.

There is no substitute for a clean forest as a fire prevention measure. Just as good housekeeping is generally recognized by insurance companies in their rate structure on insured facilities, it might be interesting to analyze from an insurance engineer's standpoint the monetary value of a completely clean forest, based on present day appraisals.



I am personally convinced that there are substantial visible benefits that would occur.

In previous testimony on the bill suggestion has been made that 14-year-old youth could not be very effective and perhaps could not profit in this program.

I submit that I have personally observed the benefits that can accrue to any youth fortunate enough to be exposed to this kind of constructive outdoor activity.

Perhaps you lived on a farm or know someone with a family who operates a farm. If so, you too have no doubt seen youngsters of this age and younger who could handle a piece of machinery, a farm animal or a bale of hay as proficiently as others who were much older. I would further venture the observation that these young people found the study of biology, science, and math considerably more relevant than their counterparts who are denied this opportunity.

I further suspect that they are better informed by actual observation of the life process about sex education—one of our more controversial subjects in public education today. I think relevance makes the difference—relevance gained by the experience of practical application of abstract theories. There is no better way to understand a theory or a principle than a personal experience or observation. A Youth Conservation Corps can provide that opportunity.

Projects such as the proposal contained in this bill have been tried in some instances on limited scale.

I had the opportunity to observe a small program operated in Lane County, Oreg., in the summers of 1961 and 1962. It was developed through the cooperative effort of the county government, local school districts, and the State board of forestry.

I might add it was coordinated by the intermediate education district which I was chairman of at that time.

I can report that it provided dramatic examples of personal benefits to students in the age group identified in this bill. The participants were selected by local school district personnel from those with evidence of potential ability but who were identified as almost certain school dropouts.

Usually they had been involved in class disturbances to their own detriment and that of other students. They were not profiting from available educational experience.

These same boys, after a summer of guided outdoor activity, returned to school with a new outlook and a new attitude, based on a personal success that had previously eluded them.

Of a group of 47 students only two failed to graduate, 26 went on to college. I might also mention that one of the two who failed to graduate got his diploma through the GED route by obtaining the equivalent certificate, so he did have the interest and desire and he found the means.

Again the dollar value of this kind of success cannot be measured, but in my discussion with school personnel I was told that the value was tremendous, not only to the participants but to their fellow students and teachers as well.

I have a copy of a report I will give to the committee of a program in 1964. It may be helpful in determining who should participate and

how they might be selected and what experience has been gained in this area.

(The document referred to follows:)

## I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this memorandum is to report the procedures and findings on a preliminary follow-up study of those boys who attended the Lane County Youth Summer Forestry Camp.

The Lane County Youth Summer Forestry Camp was organized under the auspices of State Legislation (Senate Bill #43) and operated during the summers of 1961 and 1962 by the Office of the State Forester in cooperation with the Commissioners of Lane County and the County School Superintendent.<sup>1</sup> The boys selected for this camp program were boys who in the judgment of their school principals had the ability to complete high school but whose school record and behavior indicated a lack of motivation or incentive required for successful academic work. They were, in short, boys nominated by their principals as potential high school drop-outs. The camp program was designated to provide a summer work and living experience which might mobilize these boys' sense of educational purposes and perhaps stimulate, directly or indirectly, an improved performance upon their return to school in the fall.

Our initial follow-up of these boys was conducted during the last quarter of the 1962-1963 school year and, in view of the above objectives of the camp, was designed to seek preliminary answers to some natural questions that one might ask with regard to the effectiveness of such a program.<sup>2</sup> In the first place, we wanted to see if we could determine what influence the summer camp experience has had on the subsequent school performance of those boys selected for attendance. More specifically, we wanted to see if we could determine whether such a camp represents an effective program for assisting in the prevention of individual cases of high school drop-out.

The inquiries and comments of many concerning both the camp program and our follow-up of the boys who participated suggest that some review of the rationale and procedures which we adopted for this study (in addition to a summary of our preliminary findings) would be helpful not only to those who must evaluate our findings but, in addition, to those who seek to plan and evaluate similar camp programs. In order to provide for both of the above interests and to offer some final comments of our own, the body of this report shall consist of three sections: (1) procedures, (2) findings, and (3) summary: conclusions and recommendations.

## II. PROCEDURES

In order to provide some resumé of the procedures adopted for this study, we shall offer specific comments regarding the following three aspects: (a) rationale, (b) data collection, and (c) data analysis.

### A. RATIONALE

As stated in the introduction above, our major purpose in conducting this follow-up study was to determine what influence the summer camp experience has had on the subsequent school performance of the boys selected to attend. More specifically, we hoped to obtain some basis for determining if, in fact, such a camp program represents an effective means for assisting in the presentation of individual cases of high school drop-outs.

In planning this follow-up study we concluded that any systematic effort to seek answers to the above questions would involve at least four distinct steps of inquiry.

1. We decided, first of all, that our evaluation of the camp program would have to be based upon an investigation of the subsequent school performance of those boys who were also considered to be potential drop-outs but who did not have a chance to attend the summer camp. We decided, in other words, that our first

<sup>1</sup> A detailed report of the camp program, including legislative authority, physical facilities, organization and staffing, financing, etc., is well presented in a report prepared by the Assistant State Forester responsible for that program, Mr. C. D. Maus. This report is available through the office of the State Forester, Salem, Oregon, or through the office of Dale P. Parnell, Superintendent of Schools for Lane County, Eugene, Oregon.

<sup>2</sup> A second check was made March 1964 to determine educational status for that time.



task was to identify a comparison group of boys, and for this purpose we selected the camp alternates—a group of boys who were originally nominated by their principals as potential drop-outs also but who were unable to participate in the camp program because of its limited facilities.

Our planning this first stage of inquiry included, therefore, a consideration of appropriate means by which to determine whether this group of camp alternates represents, in fact, a valid “control” group whose subsequent school performance might validly be compared with that of the camp participants. That is, we considered it important to determine, first of all, whether these two groups of boys (the participants and the alternates) can be considered essentially comparable with respect to their original status on those dimensions of academic ability, motivation and personality which we might assume to be crucial to successful school performance.

2. The next step of our planning required that we design appropriate means for determining whether and to what extent the subsequent school performance of those boys who attended the camp differs significantly from that of the comparison group. In other words, we had to decide which dimensions of subsequent school performance we were to consider relevant to our follow-up and then to devise appropriate procedures for determining to what extent our two groups of boys differ with regard to those dimensions.

3. The third stage of our planning focused upon the need to devise practical and appropriate procedures for determining whether, to what extent, and in what regard the potentially discriminating aspects of subsequent behavior evidenced by the camp participants would appear to contribute to a successful completion of high school.

4. Finally we had to plan for data collection and analysis which might provide some basis for a judgment concerning whether, to what extent, in what regard, and for whom this subsequent change in school behavior on the part of the camp population might be considered a direct result of the camp program—and, further, as a direct result of which specified aspect or aspects of that program.

In concluding our remarks here with regard to the rationale and procedures devised for conducting this follow-up study, we might acknowledge that perhaps a much simpler method would be merely to wait four years—or whatever period of time seemed appropriate—follow up our two groups of boys, compare the number of high school graduates in the two groups of boys, and on that basis make a judgement with regard to the effectiveness of the camp program as a useful means of preventing individual cases of high school drop-out. Or, it would, of course, be possible to conduct a follow-up one year after the camp program(s) and simply compare the number of drop-outs in each group. However, it would seem to us that for several reasons some combination of methods and a continuing evaluation would be more appropriate. For example, only such a continuing follow-up can provide the basis for information with regard to a longitudinal pattern of influence which the camp experience might have. Assume we discover, say, that after the first year few or none of the boys who attended the camp have withdrawn from school while a considerable number of the alternates are no longer enrolled—and that after four years the number of drop-outs or graduates in each group is essentially the same. On this evidence we might wish to consider the possibility that the camp represents a very helpful if insufficient condition for preventing drop-outs. We might consider, that is, the possibility that very important values of the camp program can be lost without some parallel efforts with regard to a continuing modification of experience for these boys during their high school years—both inside school and out.

Such speculations at the study planning state can be extended indefinitely; we hope that the above remarks serve to illustrate the kind of thinking that was a part of our own planning and that this thinking can help others to evaluate our work and to conduct their own more effectively.

## B. DATA COLLECTION

1. In considering possible data gathering instruments and procedures we felt that, ideally, they should be adequate to secure a representative sample of data with regard to each of the following dimensions assumed to be potentially significant.

## a. Source of data :

- (1) subjects (participants in the camp program and their alternates)
- (2) families of participants and alternates
- (3) camp director and staff
- (4) school records and staff
- (5) community agency records and staff (e.g. Juvenile Department)
- (6) other (e.g. employers, fellow students, etc.)

## b. Areas (with respect to subjects) :

- (1) home and family background
- (2) personality (typical behavior patterns)
- (3) educational history and present status
  - (a) general intellectual ability and academic aptitude
  - (b) general educational development and academic record
  - (c) attendance record
  - (d) interests, attitudes, study habits
  - (e) extra-curricular participation
  - (f) plans for the future (educational-vocational)
  - (g) other (e.g. perception of camp participants as an "elite"—in the eyes of school staff or other students)

## c. Areas (with respect to the camp program) :

- (1) purpose(s)—explicit and/or implicit
- (2) location, facilities, services
- (3) organization and staffing
- (4) work program(s)
- (5) fellow camp members
- (6) other

## d. Forms of data collection :

- (1) documentary (e.g. school, juvenile department, records, etc.)
- (2) questionnaire (subject, school, home, camp staff, etc.)
- (3) interview (subjects, school staff, parents, camp staff, etc.)
- (4) tests and scales
- (5) other (e.g. structured, simulated observation, etc.)

2. The fact, however, that we were immediately concerned with the need to conduct a limited and preliminary follow-up less than one full school year after the conclusion of the second summer camp program—as well as the usual limitations of time, talent, and facilities—resulted in our selecting from among the above ideal possibilities several areas of data to be obtained from one source and by means of one or possibly two data gathering techniques.

A questionnaire was developed to be completed on each boy by a school principal, dean of boys, or counselor. This questionnaire was designed to obtain information on each boy in the following general areas:

## a. Home and family :

- (1) living with parents
- (2) order of birth
- (3) parents' educational levels
- (4) economic conditions in the home
- (5) parents' attitude toward the school

## b. Educational status :

- (1) present status (enrolled, graduated, withdrawn, other)
- (2) attendance record
- (3) academic record
- (4) academic aptitude
- (5) vocational interests
- (6) typical behavior patterns
- (7) prediction regarding chances for subject finishing high school

## c. Other (camp program, etc.) :

- (1) evaluation of candidates with regard to selection criteria
- (2) changes in behavior subsequent to nomination as a candidate
- (3) judgment with regard to possible influence of camp program

In addition, an inventory of the Lane County Central Juvenile Index was conducted to determine (in the case of both camp participants and alternates) the extent of referrals to an enforcement and/or juvenile authorities *prior* to nomination as a candidate for the camp program.



## C. DATA ANALYSIS

As implied by the rationale previously outlined, our planning with respect to data analysis consisted primarily of two emphases. On the one hand, we expected to have a look at the data with a view to determining if, in fact, the two groups of boys can validly be compared. In this regard, we anticipated a need to analyze the data with respect to the characteristics of these two groups of boys at or prior to the selection of participants for the camp program in order to determine whether the group of alternates can be considered to represent a valid comparison group. Second, we expected to focus our analysis on data which should provide inferences with regard to the subsequent school performance of the camp participants, specifically in terms of the impact of the camp program.

Because of limitations of sample, data gathering procedures, and time interval we did not anticipate that our findings would admit of rigorous statistical tests of significance. Instead we expected that the best we might obtain would be gross percentage indications of possible trends in the data. Such a conservative estimate of our prospects were, we felt, consistent with the essentially descriptive exploratory nature of the follow-up effort from its inception.

## III. FINDINGS

Preliminary findings available at present on this continuing follow-up of the boys who attended the Lane County Summer Forestry Camp are summarized in this section in the three following categories: (a) a general tabulation of the study population—the two groups of boys, camp participants and alternates; (b) findings with regard to the comparability of the two groups of boys; and (c) findings with regard to differences in school success between the two groups of boys subsequent to the camp experience of the participants—including tentative suggestions with regard to possible influence of the camp performance on the performance of those boys who attended.

## A. SUBJECTS (STUDY POPULATION—CAMP PARTICIPANTS—ALTERNATES)

Twenty boys were selected as participants for the camp program the first summer (1961), thirty boys the second summer (1962). Whenever possible an alternate was named for each camp participant, and whenever possible this alternate was named from the same school district as that of the original participant. One of the alternates named the first summer replaced a camp participant who dropped out of the camp early in the program. Three of the camp participants from the first summer were named to return the following year to serve as crew leaders. In one or two instances it proved impossible to obtain adequate data on a subject. For the above reasons, the present study population consists of 87 boys distributed among the two groups and the two camp seasons as indicated below:

FIGURE 1.—TABULATION OF STUDY POPULATION

Camp season	Study population		Total
	Participants	Alternates	
1961.....	16	14	30
1962.....	29	28	57
Total.....	45	42	87

## B. COMPARABILITY OF THE TWO GROUPS (CAMP PARTICIPANTS AND ALTERNATES)

In order to determine the extent to which our two groups of boys may be considered comparable for the purpose of this study, we obtained information with respect to a variety of factors assumed to have a potential influence on the type of school performance we intended to evaluate. These factors included the following:

1. The geographic distribution of our sample
2. Their prior record of delinquent behavior
3. Several items with regard to home and family, including:
  - (a) whether they were living with parents or not
  - (b) the economic conditions in the home

(c) the place of the boys in the "family constellation" (as indicated by order of birth)

(d) the parents' level of educational attainment (in terms of highest grade level completed)

(e) the parents' attitude toward school and education (as viewed by members of the school staff)

4. Several items with regard to school success, including:

(a) past academic performance, including:

(1) average level of grades received in high school

(2) number of subjects failed in high school

(3) performance on standardized tests of general education development

(b) academic aptitude or capacity (potential), including:

(1) ratings by members of the school staff

(2) results of standardized tests of intelligence or academic aptitude

(c) personality traits (as rated by members of the school staff)

(d) vocational interests

5. An overall rating of the comparability of these two groups in terms of the criteria for selection established for the camp program, including:

(a) ratings on the above provided by members of the school staff

(b) a composite rating based on all available evidence provided by the school questionnaire

This section of the report shall consist of a brief resumé of our findings with respect to each of the above variables specifically with regard to the comparability of the two groups of boys for the purpose of this study.

### 1. Geographic distribution

A tabulation of the geographic distribution of the boys in our study indicates that approximately 50% of the camp participants came from high schools outside the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan area, while some 40% of the alternates came from similar locations. Since the schools of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan area enroll approximately  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the high school students of the county, we would note that boys from high schools located in the more "rural" areas of the county are perhaps more adequately represented in *both* of our study groups. We do not feel, however, that the slightly higher percentage of these "rural" boys in the group of camp participants shall be materially significant in interpreting possible differences in the school performance of these two groups of boys.

A tabulation of our findings with regard to geographic distribution is provided in figure 2 below:

FIGURE 2.—GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY POPULATION

[In percent]

Location <sup>1</sup>	Participant	Alternate
"rural".....	49.9	40.5
"metropolitan".....	50.1	59.5
Total.....	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> "metropolitan": Subjects enrolled in high schools of Eugene-Springfield. "Rural": Subjects enrolled in Lane County high schools outside Eugene-Springfield.

### 2. Delinquency index

The Lane County Summer Forestry Camp, while designed to be of positive influence on boys who were potential high school drop-outs, was not intended to be a camp for juvenile delinquents. It was not organized nor was it staffed as a rehabilitation facility. Instead, the value of its potential influence was anticipated to be essentially preventative in nature. We might also anticipate, however, that 20% or more of any group of adolescent boys will have had some contact



with law enforcement and juvenile authorities.<sup>1</sup> In view of this, and in order to obtain some indication of possible significant differences between our two groups of boys with respect to delinquent behavior, an inventory of the Lane County Central Juvenile Index<sup>2</sup> was conducted. This inventory provided us with a tabulation of the recorded incidence of referral for delinquent behavior *prior to* the camp program (s). A tabulation of this inventory indicates a record of some such contact for approximately 38% of the camp participants—as compared with a similar record of 45% of the alternates. We conclude, on the basis of this, that while the group of alternates would appear to be somewhat more prone to behavior which brings them to the attention of the Juvenile Index, there is no clear evidence to suggest that differences in subsequent school performance on the part of either group of boys must be attributed directly to this variable. However, because there are additional aspects of the data obscured by the gross summary percentages, we shall indicate below a more detailed tabulation of our finding in this area.

FIGURE 3.—RECORD OF DELINQUENCY

[In percent]

Delinquency Code	Camp participants			Camp alternates		
	1962	1961	Total	1962	1961	Total
Nondelinquent.....	65.5	37.5	55.6	57.1	21.4	45.2
Delinquent.....	24.1	62.5	37.8	42.6	78.6	54.8
Other.....	6.9	0	4.4	0	0	0
No information.....	3.4	0	2.2	0	0	0
Total.....	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.7	100.0	100.0

### 3. Parents education level

In planning this follow-up study we anticipate the possibility that differences in school performance between the two groups of boys might be the result of different educational expectations held for either group by significant adults. We anticipated, further, that the actual level of educational attainment represented by the parents of these two groups of boys might represent a direct expression of the level of education expectation most influential in the lives of these boys. In order to obtain, therefore, some such estimate of "education expectation," our school questionnaire included items requesting information regarding the number of years of school completed by both parents of each boy. Our findings with regard to this variable indicate that this kind of information is not ordinarily available from school records; in more than half the cases, no information was available. Apparently those in the school responsible for this area feel that some knowledge of the educational level of the parents of their students is not worth the effort to gather and record in some systematic way. Because of the inadequacy of our data with respect to this variable, we hesitate to generalize regarding the significance of our findings and merely report what we were able to obtain with the observation that we find nothing to suggest our two groups to be significantly different on this variable.

<sup>1</sup> A recent and rather exhaustive inventory of juvenile case records in Lane County undertaken in connection with the work of the Lane County Youth Study Board indicates that although perhaps only some 3-4 percent of the adolescents in the county may have some contact with law enforcement and juvenile authorities in any *one* year of record, some 24 percent will probably have had some such contact with these agencies sometime during their adolescent years. (John Covall, Lane County Youth Study Board Project Staff, personal communication).

<sup>2</sup> A central listing of adolescents whose behavior has resulted in referral to juvenile or police authorities—as reported by those agencies and the schools.

FIGURE 4.—PARENTS' EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

[In percent]

Highest grade completed	Father		Mother		Average of both parents	
	P	A	P	A	P	A
Less than 8th grade.....	2.2	4.8	4.4	4.8	3.3	2.4
Grammar school (8th grade).....	8.9	14.3	6.7	4.8	7.7	9.5
Some high school (grades 9 to 11).....	11.0	2.4	2.2	12.0	6.7	7.2
High school (12th grade).....	15.6	16.7	20.2	16.7	17.7	16.7
Some college or technical training.....	4.4	4.8	8.9	11.9	6.6	8.3
No information.....	57.8	57.1	57.8	54.8	57.8	56.0
Total.....	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.2	99.8	100.1

#### 4. Order of birth

In planning this follow-up study, we had no definite preconceptions with respect to a possible relationship between the school performance of our subjects and their placement within the "family constellation." However, in order to obtain one type of information with respect to such a possible relationship, we did collect data on the order of birth of these boys. Our data on this variable are tabulated in figure 5 below :

FIGURE 5.—ORDER OF BIRTH

[In percent]

Order	Participants	Alternates
Only child.....	0	4.8
1st born.....	40.0	33.3
"Middle" child (having both older and younger siblings).....	24.4	23.8
Last born.....	22.2	23.8
No information.....	13.3	14.3
Total.....	99.9	100.0
Average number of children in those families on whom information was available.....	4.03	3.69

On the basis of the above data, we concluded that these two groups are essentially comparable with respect to their position within the "family constellation" as explained by order of birth.

#### 5. Living with parents

80% of our camp participants were living with their parents at the time of their nomination for the summer camp program—as compared with 88% of the camp alternates. In view of this, we conclude that although a boy living with his parents was perhaps not quite so apt to be chosen for the camp program, our two groups of boys are essentially comparable insofar as this variable may be said to influence their school record.

#### 6. Economic conditions in the home

Many who have investigated the problem of high school drop-outs suggest that a good percentage of those students with the ability for successful academic performance but who fail to respond to the opportunities for a high school education come from homes where the economic conditions are seriously inadequate. In nominating potential drop-outs for the Lane County Summer Forestry Camp Program, high school principals were asked to take the economic conditions of the home into consideration. To obtain information concerning the comparability of our two groups of boys on this variable, we asked the school to rate the economic conditions of the homes. On the basis of the data obtained we would consider that the group of participants appear to come more frequently from homes where economic conditions are judged (by school authorities, at least) to be below average or poor—as we might expect in view of the criteria used to nominate and select boys for this camp program. We are, however, unable to anticipate the extent for which this apparent difference in economic conditions in the home indicate a real difference in the comparability of our two groups for the purpose of this study. Our results are tabulated in figure 6 below :



FIGURE 6.—ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF THE HOME

[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Good.....	11.1	9.5
Above average.....	31.1	50.0
Below average.....	40.0	28.6
Very poor.....	13.3	7.1
No information.....	4.4	4.8
Total.....	99.9	100.0

### 7. Attitudes of the Home regarding school

We would presume that a boy's general response to high school is significantly influenced by the attitudes that his parents express regarding education and school. In order to obtain some indication of the comparability of our two groups of boys with respect to this factor, we asked the school authorities to rate the attitudes toward school expressed by the parents of these boys. Our findings in this area indicate that:

(a) almost 45% of the parents of the camp participants are rated by the school to be cooperative and supportive of the school—while less than 22% of the parents of the alternates are similarly viewed by the school.

(b) almost 60% of the parents of the alternates are rated by the school as ambivalent in their attitudes toward the school—while approximately 28% of the participants' parents are similarly rated by the school.

(c) approximately 18% of the parents of the participants are rated by the school as distant or noncommittal in their attitudes toward the school—while less than 10% of the parents of the alternates are so rated.

(d) less than 7% of parents in *both* groups were viewed by the school as actively hostile to that school.

In view of the above findings, we would conclude that among the parents of these two groups of boys there are some real differences in the attitudes with which those parents view the school. We would conclude, in addition, that these differences in attitude may well have a significant impact on the school performance evidenced by these two groups of boys.

In addition to information on the comparability of our two study groups with regard to the above dimensions of home and family background, data were gathered concerning comparability with regard to prior school performance. The specific variables on which information was obtained and analyzed included: (1) general academic performance as indicated by grades obtained, the number of courses failed, and performance on tests of general education development; (2) academic aptitude—as indicated by the rating of school staff members and performance on standardized tests of general intelligence, and; (3) personality traits and typical patterns of school behavior—as indicated by the ratings of school staff members. A summary of our findings in these areas comprises the next three items of this section.

### 8. Academic performance

As indicated above, information was obtained on our two groups of boys specifically with regard to their school grades, their performance on tests of general educational development and the number of courses they failed in grades 9–12. Our results indicate that the group of alternates tend, on the whole, to receive both higher and lower grades than the participant group. More members of this group receive A's and more members receive F's. On the other hand, our results indicate that the total number of subjects failed is about the same for each group. We would conclude, therefore, that apparently several of the camp participants whose academic record is otherwise adequate fail individual courses, while a few, perhaps one or two, of the alternates account for the majority of the total number of F's obtained by that group. With regard to results obtained from standardized tests of general educational development we find no indication of significant differences between our two groups. Such results, however, are *not* available on the alternates in one case out of five. (As contrasted with a 15.6% "no information" return on participants.) Perhaps this is the result of a general tendency on the part of the alternates to be absent on the days that such tests are given—or the disinclination, or inability, of the school to follow through on a re-testing for them. Our findings with regard to these three indications of academic performance are summarized in the three figures which follow:

FIGURE 7.—ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE: SCHOOL GRADES  
[In percent]

School grades "mostly"	Participants	Alternates
A's.....	0	2.4
B's.....	11.1	7.1
C's.....	51.1	47.6
D's.....	37.8	33.3
F's.....	0	9.5
Total.....	100.0	9.9

FIGURE 8.—ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE: SUBJECTS FAILED, GRADE 9 TO 12  
[In percent]

Number of subjects failed	Participants	Alternates
0.....	24.4	26.2
1 to 2.....	42.2	40.4
3 to 5.....	24.4	26.3
plus 5.....	8.8	7.2
Total.....	99.8	100.1

FIGURE 9.—ACADEMIC PERFORMANCES: TEST OF GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SD <sup>1</sup>	Participants	Alternates
+3.....	0	0
+2.....	6.7	2.3
+1.....	24.4	38.0
-1.....	31.1	26.1
-2.....	13.3	9.5
-3.....	8.9	2.3
No information.....	15.6	21.4
Total.....	100.0	99.6

<sup>1</sup>Standard deviation percentile rank equivalents:

SD	Percentile rank (range)
+3.....	99+
+2.....	98+
+1.....	50-84
-1.....	16-49
-2.....	2-15
-3.....	1

### 9. Academic aptitude

In order to obtain some indication of the comparability of these two groups of boys specifically with regard to their respective ability to profit from the academic program of the schools, information was obtained from two different sources. We asked members of the school staff to rate the academic aptitude of the boys in these two groups, and we gathered information available with regard to the performance of these boys on standardized tests of general intelligence. Our results suggest, on the one hand, that the group of alternates is viewed by the school staff to be somewhat more able in this regard than the participants. More of the alternates are judged to have academic aptitude that is "excellent" and "good"—while fewer are judged to have "poor" or "very poor" academic aptitude. This trend, however, is not entirely supported by our inventory of the available estimate of ability provided by the results of standardized tests of general intelligence. For, while 37.7% of the participants score at or above the mean on these tests (as compared with 40.3% of the alternates) and 44.4% of them score below the mean (as compared with 40.3 of the alternates), the differences are very small and equivocal in view of the fact that test results were unavailable on almost one fifth of *both* groups. We would conclude, therefore, that



although there is no strong evidence to suggest that our two study groups are not comparable with respect to the ability of each to profit from the essentially academic aspects of the school program, if they do in fact differ, the group of alternates is perhaps a somewhat more able group. Our results are summarized in figures 10 and 11 below :

FIGURE 10.—ACADEMIC APTITUDE (TEACHERS' RATINGS)  
[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Excellent.....	4.4	7.1
Good.....	20.0	26.2
Average.....	46.7	20.5
Poor.....	26.7	19.0
Very poor.....	0	4.8
No information.....	2.2	2.4
Total.....	100.0	100.0

FIGURE 11.—ACADEMIC APTITUDE (INTELLIGENCE TEST RESULTS)  
[In percent]

S D <sup>1</sup>	Participants	Alternates
+3.....	0	2.3
+2.....	4.4	
+1.....	33.3	38.0
-1.....	35.6	26.1
-2.....	6.7	14.2
-3.....	2.2	0
No information.....	17.8	19.0
Total.....	100.0	99.6

<sup>1</sup> For percentile equivalents see footnote on fig. 9.

#### 10. Behavior traits

It seems reasonable to presume that there are specific traits of personality and typical patterns of school behavior which either facilitate, or militate against, a successful high school record; were our two groups of boys to differ significantly with regard to personality traits or typical patterns of school behavior, we might seriously question whether they can be considered comparable for the purpose of this study. Therefore, in order to obtain some indication of comparability in this regard, we asked members of the school staff to complete a personality rating scale on each boy. The instrument that we selected for this purpose is the NASSP Personality Record.<sup>1</sup> This record provides for a rating in one of five descriptive intervals on eight dimensions of personality and behavior. The results which we obtained on each of these dimensions are presented in Figures 12-19 following :

<sup>1</sup> National Association of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. (Copyright, 1958)

FIGURE 12.—BEHAVIOR TRAIT A: "MOTIVATION" (TEACHER'S RATING)  
[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Highly motivated.....	0	0
Effectively motivated.....	15.6	19.0
Usually purposeful.....	48.9	42.9
Vacillating.....	31.0	19.0
Purposeless.....	4.4	9.5
No rating.....		9.5
Total.....	99.9	99.9

FIGURE 13.—BEHAVIOR TRAIT B: "INDUSTRY" (TEACHERS' RATING)

[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Seeks additional work.....	0	0
Prepares assigned work regularly.....	4.4	14.3
Needs occasional prodding.....	66.7	57.1
Seldom works even under pressure.....	24.4	14.3
No rating.....		4.8
Total.....	99.9	100.0

FIGURE 14.—BEHAVIOR TRAIT C: "INITIATIVE" (TEACHERS' RATING)

[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Actively creative.....	0	0
Consistently self-reliant.....	6.7	7.1
Frequently initiates.....	37.8	33.3
Seldom initiates.....	33.3	40.5
Merely conforms.....	22.2	14.3
No rating.....		4.8
Total.....	100.0	100.0

FIGURE 15.—BEHAVIOR TRAIT D: "LEADERSHIP" (TEACHERS' RATING)

[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Judgment respected.....	0	0
Contributes in important affairs.....	2.2	4.8
Sometimes in minor affairs.....	55.6	52.4
Cooperative but retiring.....	28.9	26.2
Negative.....	13.3	11.9
No rating.....		4.8
Total.....	100.0	100.0

FIGURE 16.—BEHAVIOR TRAIT E: "CONCERN FOR OTHERS" (TEACHERS' RATING)

[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Deeply and actively concerned.....	0	0
Generally concerned.....	8.9	7.1
Somewhat generally concerned.....	64.4	50.0
Self-centered.....	22.2	14.3
Indifferent.....	4.4	23.8
No rating.....		4.8
Total.....	99.9	100.0

FIGURE 17.—BEHAVIOR TRAIT F: "RESPONSIBILITY" (TEACHERS' RATINGS)

[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Assumes much responsibility.....	0	0
Conscientious.....	8.9	9.5
Usually dependable.....	51.1	38.1
Somewhat dependable.....	31.0	26.2
Unreliable.....	8.9	21.4
No rating.....		4.8
Total.....	99.9	100.0



FIGURE 18.—BEHAVIOR TRAIT G: "INTEGRITY" (TEACHERS' RATINGS)

[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Consistently trustworthy.....	2.2	0
Reliable; dependable.....	13.3	11.9
Generally honest.....	55.6	42.9
Questionable at times.....	8.9	19.0
Not dependable.....	4.4	9.5
No rating.....	15.6	16.7
Total.....	100.0	100.0

FIGURE 19.—BEHAVIOR TRAIT H: "EMOTIONAL STABILITY" (TEACHERS' RATING)

[In percent]

Rating	Participants	Alternates
Exceptionally stable.....		4.8
Well balanced.....		2.4
Usually well balanced.....		
Excitable.....	53.3	50.0
Hyperemotional.....	2.2	2.4
Unresponsive.....	20.0	7.1
Apathetic.....	24.4	28.6
No information.....		4.8
Total.....	99.9	100.0

A review of the above results indicates that:

(a) differences between the two groups in the percentage of boys in each receiving any specific rating range from a low of .6% (ignoring, that is, instances in which no member of either group received a given rating) to a high of 19.4% (Concern for Others; Indifference).

(b) such differences between the two groups are close to or above ten percent on twelve of the 42 individual ratings possible.

(c) on two of the trait dimensions (C: "Initiative" and D: "Leadership") none of these differences in ratings exceeds 8 percent—and in the case of trait D, the greatest difference is 3.2%.

(d) on three of the five possible ratings for trait B, "Industry," the difference in percentage of boys in the two groups receiving the same rating is close to or exceeds 10%.

(e) school staff members were frequently (i.e., more than 15% of the time) unable or unwilling to rate boys in *either* group on "Integrity," (trait G).

(f) school staff members were otherwise more prone to respond with a "no-rating return for boys in the alternate group.

These findings and observations lead us to conclude that members of the school staff appear to view these two groups of boys as essentially similar with respect to a wide variety of personality traits and typical modes or patterns of behavior. This similarity would appear to be especially evident with respect to the ratings which boys in either group receive on such traits as initiative and leadership. It is somewhat less evident and yet substantial with respect to traits of motivation and emotional stability. On the other hand, there are perhaps significant differences in the view that members of the school staff express concerning these two groups of boys specifically with respect to attributes of Industry.

Thus, only 4.4% of the camp participants were rated as preparing assigned work regularly (as compared with 14.3% of the alternates)—while 91% were rated as requiring occasional prodding or constant pressure with assigned school work (as compared with 71.4% of the alternates). (Such a finding might conceivably be explained by the fact that for one reason or another school staff members were more inclined, or more able, to prod boys in the participant group—that these boys are viewed as "worth the trouble" or in some way more responsive in a positive way, to it.) Another example of perhaps significant differences in the view that members of the school staff are willing to express concerning these two groups of boys is the finding that almost 15% of the participants were rated to be "somewhat socially concerned" (as contrasted with only

50.0% of the alternates)—while almost one in four of the alternates was rated as socially indifferent (as contrasted to 4.4% of the participants similarly rated). Other examples: participants includes more boys rated as generally dependable and fewer as unreliable; more participants are rated as generally honest.

We would attempt to summarize our reactions to these findings with the suggestion that apparent similarities *and* differences in the view which school staff members express concerning the behavioral traits of the boys in these two groups may well represent distinct variables which influence or determine to a significant degree one or more aspects of the subsequent school performance of these two groups.

#### 11. Selection Criteria

As indicated in an earlier section of this report, the Lane County Summer Forestry Camp program was intended for boys with the ability to succeed in high school who, for one reason or another, were considered by school staff members to be potential drop-outs. It was not explicitly intended to be a rehabilitation facility for juvenile delinquents nor was it specifically designed to provide a therapeutic situation for the emotionally maladjusted. Instead, it was intended for the boys who as a result of this summer experience, might, in the opinion of the school staff, be motivated to remain in school and, eventually, graduate from the 12th grade. And as one final indication of the extent to which our two groups of boys, the camp participants and their alternates, may be considered comparable for the purposes of a follow-up study designed to estimate the impact of the summer program on the subsequent school performance of the participants, we asked members of the school staff to provide us with global ratings on each of the boys specifically with regard to the nomination and selection criteria established. Our findings indicate that in the opinion of the school staff, the participants comprise a group which met the original criteria to a significantly greater degree than did the group of alternates. Almost nine out of ten "good" candidates specifically with regard to the established criteria while only slightly more than 50% of the alternates were similarly rated. We were unable to obtain ratings on more than 10% of the alternates (as compared with only 2.2% "no response" returns on the participants). Despite this limitation of the data, we are led to anticipate the possibility that the findings which we may obtain on our two groups with respect to significant differences in original characteristics of these two groups of boys as suggested by these ratings. A summary of the data on this dimension is presented in Figure 20 below:

FIGURE 20.—SELECTION CRITERIA (TEACHERS' RATINGS)

[In percent]

Rating <sup>1</sup>	Participants	Alternates
Excellent candidate.....	24.4	4.8
Good candidate.....	64.4	50.0
Average candidate.....	6.7	28.6
Poor candidate.....	2.2	4.8
No response.....	2.2	11.9
Total.....	99.9	100.1

<sup>1</sup>Specifically with regard to nomination criteria originally provided to school officers at the time nominees and participants were selected.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (WITH RESPECT TO THE COMPARABILITY OF THE TWO GROUPS)

In the previous eleven sections we have reported our findings with regard to a wide variety of information obtained in order to determine the extent to which our two groups of boys may be considered comparable for the purposes of this follow-up study designed to estimate the impact of the Summer Forestry Camp program. As indicated earlier, our intent was to sample in a representative manner a wide variety of factors which we assumed to have potential influence on the type of school performance we planned to evaluate as the basis of our follow-up. In summarizing our findings with regard to these dimensions of comparability we have suggested, first of all, that there is good evidence for con-



cluding that these two groups of boys are substantially similar in a variety of important ways and, at the same time, that there is some indication of specific dimensions of comparability on which they may well differ significantly. In addition, we reported several areas of comparability in which, for a variety of reasons, the findings are difficult to interpret in an unequivocal manner.

The camp participants and their alternates would appear to represent two groups of boys essentially similar with respect to geographic distribution, approximately the same percent of each group was selected from rural and from metropolitan school and residence locations. These two groups would appear to be essentially similar with respect to the "family constellation" of the boys, as indicated by their order of birth. Approximately the same percent of each is living with the natural parents. They appear to be similar with respect to prior academic performance, as indicated by course grades and results of standardized tests of general educational development. And, finally, it would appear that on a wide variety of behavior traits these two groups of boys are viewed by members of the school staff as essentially comparable.

Our findings indicate, however, that there may well be significant differences between these two groups with respect to the economic conditions existing in the homes, at least as these conditions are viewed by members of the school staff. The groups of participants appear to come more frequently from homes where the economic conditions are rated as below average or poor. Among the parents of these two groups of boys there may well be some real differences in the attitudes which those parents express toward the school—again, as viewed by members of the school staff. The two groups may not be entirely comparable with respect to academic aptitude as indicated by teachers' ratings and the results of standardized tests of intelligence; there is some indication that the alternates comprise a group characterized by somewhat greater dispersion and slightly greater mean ability. And although these two groups are viewed by members of the school staff to be quite similar with respect to a variety of behavior traits, there are, at the same time, several dimensions of behavior on which rather obvious differences in rating were obtained, e.g., traits of "industry". Finally, our results indicate that these two groups of boys are not strictly comparable with respect to the original criteria for selection established for the camp program; as might be anticipated, the participants are rated by members of the school staff as comprising a group which met the original criteria to a significantly greater degree than the group of alternates.

In addition to the above, there were two other dimensions of comparability in which the findings are difficult to interpret in an unequivocal manner. On the one hand, we found that while the group of alternates would appear to be somewhat more prone to behavior which brings them to the attention of the Lane County Juvenile Index, it is difficult to estimate the extent to which this difference may influence to any significant degree the comparability of our groups for the purposes of this follow-up study. (We also found wide differences with respect to this dimension of comparability between the 1962 and 1963 groups of both participants and alternates. One other area in which our findings are difficult to interpret is that of the parents' level of educational development. And, as indicated in our report of that material, the difficulty here is in large measure a direct result of our lack of information with respect to this variable. Although we realize that the level of educational development of the parents may well be a very important dimension of comparability, the fact that we were unable to obtain any relevant information from school officers on more than 50% of our subjects, precludes our being able to estimate, in any reliable way, the possible significance of this variable for our study here.

This concludes our discussion of the comparability of the two study groups, the camp participants and their alternates. It is upon the findings summarized here that the significance of difference in subsequent school performance as evidenced by the camp participants or the alternates must be evaluated.

Mr. SWANSON. There have been suggestions that the proposal is so limited in continuity that it would be of doubtful value. It is my opinion that the limited scope of the program is more of an asset than a hindrance.

Other programs that have operated on a more massive scale have encountered some extensive criticism. If the criticism is valid it would

appear that there have been some massive errors in the development and operation of some of the programs.

It seems to me that some less expensive experience might be gained from pilot programs that could be developed by the application of techniques acquired through the operation of projects proposed in YCC legislation.

The short-term aspect which to some appears to limit its effectiveness, can be a virtue in the kind of innovative, creative atmosphere we need to develop a constructive, personally profitable experience for those who can participate.

I am not suggesting that other programs are so ineffective that we need to superimpose another one to duplicate something that already exists. I am saying that this kind of program has had considerable success where it has been tried and that further experience and experimentation can develop, on a small scale, the techniques and the personnel to make those full-time programs more effective.

At the same time it will develop a sense of successful responsible citizenship in the participants—both supervisors and supervised and it will return not only those intangible benefits but vitally important tangible benefits that will contribute to the prosperity and the quality of environment for us all.

On behalf of Western Forest Industries Association, I thank you for the privilege of speaking in support of the principles embodied in this legislation.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you very much, Mr. Swanson. I was just speaking to the gentlelady from Oregon that you show an unusual perception of the human values involved in this bill and the potential of it.

I am particularly interested and struck for the testimony you present with regard to the pilot program nature of this proposal and certainly agree wholeheartedly with you that this is something we ought to start on the basis of a pilot program.

I have a lot of feeling that it will work. But I think we should start with a pilot project. I am particularly interested as I am sure all of us here now are, about reforestation of the public lands.

I am aware that the planting season for reforestation might not coincide with the summer program envisioned here, but what value do you think this type of program could be with an effort to reforest our national forests and the Bureau of Land Management lands?

Mr. SWANSON. I am not a graduate forester but I have observed some of the things that occur in the woods that enhance reforestation. In the particular area where I come from, just a simple removal of debris would help young trees to get a start.

We have enough rainfall that there is natural regeneration if there is any type of seed source within the area. The removal of debris, the preparation of these things are important, and the one that I mentioned, fire prevention, because you can spend a lot of time re-seeding and replanting and you can lose it all in one fell swoop if you are not able to protect with firebreaks and trails.

Mr. MEEDS. It was pointed out yesterday that particularly the 17- and 18-year-olds involved, could also be utilized in fire protection and firefighting.



Mr. SWANSON. Right; they can and they are.

Mr. MEEDS. They are used today at that age, aren't they, for fire-fighting?

Mr. SWANSON. Right.

Mr. MEEDS. Is there any possibility that they might also be used in present commercial thinning operations where there have been effective reforestation projects?

Mr. SWANSON. This is done on a private basis, many times, now where they are used for pruning and for thinning. I know of a couple of boys this past summer who initiated their own business cutting small trees for fence posts. They sold to another gentleman who used machinery to take off the bark and then sold them and had quite a business for small construction project materials.

Mr. MEEDS. In your business are you subject to the quality and quantity of soft woods available from public lands?

Mr. SWANSON. Right.

Mr. MEEDS. In my congressional district I feel the vibration from this quickly so I am doubly interested in it. I have been, since before I came to Congress, and presently am, very concerned that the public lands of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management are really not being managed for optimum return in terms of timber production. One of the very salient reasons for this is a lack of prompt reforestation in present commercial areas, roads, fire trails, fire prevention—all of these things which I feel these people could be involved with.

Would you agree with me that they could?

Mr. SWANSON. This matter of commercial thinning, I think, has a tremendous potential in not only the development of products we are not now using such as the fence posts, this is one way, but it also improves the ability of the lands to produce more timber in the final analysis while providing jobs and projects that are useful.

Mr. MEEDS. That is what I am concerned with; it is not being done fully.

Mr. SWANSON. This is being done on private lands now in some cases and I am sure it could be expanded to public lands.

Mr. MEEDS. I certainly appreciate your testimony and my commendation to you personally and to the association which you are representing.

I would like to call on our Congressman John Dellenback next.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Ray, it is a very real pleasure for me to join in welcoming you. This is not a subcommittee on which I am a regular member but I am here in large part because I understood you were to be with us today.

Mr. SWANSON. I am sorry I was not able to advise you sooner because I was not sure when the committee would meet.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I do want to say for the record and for the sake of my colleagues, that I know Mr. Swanson quite well. Not only is he a very sound member of the business community in my district, but I think even more importantly he has played a very significant part in education in the local areas and in the State at large and has been a tremendous asset to education in various ways throughout the State of Oregon, as I say not only on a local level but as a very active leader on the State level.

The type of concern he has shown in education is the same type of thing that is shown by your testimony here today, Ray.

I have read through your testimony and you and I both know about whom you are talking when you give your example here and what he has contributed also to the State from his background with the CCC.

I can indeed attest that he has profited from having this background and he is a real leader in our area and in our State.

I have followed your testimony carefully and I think you have given us some valuable and helpful thinking. I express our appreciation to you for taking time to come this far. We are grateful for your willingness to do so and giving us this helpful testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SWANSON. On behalf of the association I would like to express our appreciation for being able to support this kind of legislation.

Mr. MEEDS. The gentlelady from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The chairman rightfully commented on the perception which you have and if I may say so it is not only because of your innate ability in that area but also the tremendous experience you have had in educational matters in working with programs with young people.

I wonder if I can ask you to expand a little bit on the Eugene program. You were very modest in your discussion of that, Mr. Swanson.

Mr. SWANSON. Thank you.

Mrs. GREEN. Would you do that? We are thinking about a variety of programs that might be possible under this legislation.

Mr. SWANSON. I expected to leave the report with the committee.

Mr. MEEDS. I ask unanimous consent that one copy be made part of the record.

Mr. SWANSON. It goes into detail as to the method of selection. I might comment because this does follow the pattern that is proposed here of not limiting it to economically disadvantaged youth. I happen to feel that there are many kinds of disadvantaged youth and some of them are disadvantaged not by the lower echelons of the economic scale but also, perhaps, by too much affluence.

Mrs. GREEN. I think this comment of his is just very, very important. I think it is one of the great fallacies that we have found in the war on poverty. We have assumed that disadvantaged youths are the ones who come from an economically low level home. I have known many people whom I considered to be among the most advantaged people because of the quality of the parents that are in that home and the aspirations that have been set for them even though they don't have the actual dollars and cents.

I think the sooner we could get rid of that myth the better off we will be in all of our programs. We talk about segregation in race, color or creed, and at the same time we promulgate a segregation on the basis of class based on dollars.

I think it is essential that we get away from that.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Would the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The other half of what Mr. Swanson has said to which you were referring is that not only are those who come from economically poor backgrounds truly advantaged in some very rich and wonderful ways but unfortunately those who come from back-



ground where there is a good deal of material wealth are sometimes deprived in some tremendously important things.

I gather what you were saying here is you would see this measure very advantageous to reach some of those who might be materially quite good but who maybe because of that affluence have been deprived of some very precious qualities and training, am I correct?

Mr. SWANSON. I believe that poverty is not limited to money, I believe that poverty could be applied to the lack of self discipline. I think there is a poverty of self-discipline because of affluence and self-discipline is one of the things that is sadly lacking in our society.

I could give you some other examples of people who might be considered in the poverty area in terms of money but whom I consider very wealthy in terms of the ability to shift for themselves.

I have to contrast this with others because in a business you get to read a story just in looking at your payroll. If you look at the checks to see where they have cashed them and whether they went to the bank or went to the local tavern, when you see someone who is not able to pay the rent even though they are making quite a sum of money, you know the money has been diverted to some other channels.

I know of a widow whose children lost their father when the oldest son was about 10 years old and there were five children in the family.

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, in that regard I would like to see us give thought to a new definition in this bill, one that would provide that the people who will be eligible would be the ones who have poverty of the spirit. Poverty of the spirit would not exclude those who are economically disadvantaged because certainly in many cases there is the poverty of the spirit in the poor home but it would also include the others. It might also enlighten us upon a new course in our definition of the disadvantaged which would be more realistic.

Mr. SWANSON. I have seen this lady to whom I referred with the five children. One just graduated from Oregon State University as a pharmacist and he did not have help. I tried to help him get a scholarship but he is just a little bit below the level of academic achievement that was required.

But I remember in my recommendation that I assured the committee that whether or not they made the scholarship available to him I was sure he would get there, somehow. He did.

There are four other children in that family and each one is making a success in their own way. While my family might be considered an affluent family in this particular community, I am proud and happy to have my son associate with this boy. I think it is a privilege for my boy to be able to associate with him even though they might be considered people who were at the poverty level in terms of the measurements we have been using. I agree with Mrs. Green that is wrong.

Mrs. GREEN. On this Eugene project, tell us what age group and what length of time. I am fairly familiar with it from newspapers.

Mr. SWANSON. These were sophomores through seniors. It was a 2-year program and the first year they had anticipated having 20 and again, hopefully, they would gather from these 20 some who would be leaders in the second-year program and three of these were leaders in the second-year program.

They had a total of 47 who participated. They came from sophomores through seniors which would be approximately 15 through 18 years.

Mrs. GREEN. For how long a period of time?

Mr. SWANSON. Just two summers in a 90-day program.

Mrs. GREEN. Was there a stipend paid?

Mr. SWANSON. I believe that there was. I am not certain of this. I do note that the cost was just slightly over \$1,000 per student and it was financed by the county.

It was operated by the State Board of Forestry and there is another analysis of this program that was done by a member of the State forestry department that I do not have but I will attempt to get it and furnish it to the committee because this would be an observation from a different viewpoint.

This is the one where they made the selection and the followup so far as their academic ability. I think there might be a more significant analysis made by the people who worked with them.

Mrs. GREEN. I would ask unanimous consent to have this additional material put in the record when it is supplied.

Mr. MEEDS. Without objection it is so ordered.

(The document referred to follows:)

#### A REPORT ON THE SUMMER CAMP PROGRAM

##### GENERAL

The 1961 legislative assembly passed into law the Summer Camp Program which is now O.R.S. Sections 418.705 through 418.730.

The law gives the State Forester, through the State Board of Forestry, responsibility for administration of the camp program in cooperation with Oregon counties and provided for the 1961-1963 biennium, an account of \$50,000 for activation of the program.

Under the law, the State Forester is responsible for providing facilities and equipment for the camps and for administration and supervision of the camps.

Cooperating county responsibilities are selection of participants and payment of costs of salaries and subsistence for the participants.

Objectives of the program are to provide suitable work projects of a forest conservation nature and wholesome and healthful outdoor recreational activities for boys between the ages of 15 and 19 during the summer months. Work projects are confined to publicly-owned forest lands.

In cooperation with Lane County, one camp for twenty boys was established for the summer of 1961.

The camp was located on county park property on Mosby Creek about nine miles southeast of Cottage Grove. Facilities were completed early in July; the camp opened on July 10 and ran through September 1.

The pilot program continued during summer, 1962 with reopening of the Lane County Camp with thirty participants. One additional camp was opened in cooperation with Marion County with twenty participants selected by the Marion County School Superintendent.

This second camp was located on the Little North Fork of the Santiam River about four miles above Mehama.

The Lane and Marion county camps were opened on June 18 and 19 respectively, and operated through August 31.

Participants were on the payroll of the Department as Student Workers at a salary rate of \$138.00 per month, less \$50.00 for board.

Counties were billed at the end of each summer for cost of boys' salaries and subsistence.

##### CREW SELECTION

The summer Camp Program law places responsibility for selection of boys upon the County School Superintendent in the participating county.



The selection process initiated by the Lane County School Superintendent, and followed in Marion County, was aimed at potential school dropouts.

School principals were asked to observe the following criteria in making their nominations for participation. (Quoted from report of October 10, 1961 by Dale Parnell, Lane County School Superintendent) :

(a) This was not a camp for juvenile delinquents.

(b) Neither was it a camp to provide a summer vacation for the average, or better-than-average all American boy.

(c) Principals were asked to nominate boys (ages 15, 16, 17 and 18) whose parents were having a financially difficult time, and who had average or better than average intelligence, and who were potential school dropouts. The home situation was to be taken into consideration (such as an unsettled or broken home).

(d) In general, principals were asked to nominate boys who would profit greatly from this kind of experience; who, as a result of this experience, might be helped to remain in school to complete graduation.

(e) The parents (or parent) must consent to the boy working in this kind of activity.

Each of the camps thus had a cross section of boys with problems—potential school dropouts with the intelligence and ability to complete high school.

#### CAMP FACILITIES

In planning for the camp facilities, consideration was given to the necessity of sanitation, reasonable comfort, portability and length and time of occupancy. A complete tent set up was first considered and then rejected because of its not measuring up to the requirements of sanitation and comfort for an eleven week period of use.

A decision was made to construct semi-portable unsealed frame buildings for mess hall, kitchen, shower house, cooks quarters and tool house and to house crew members and supervisory employees in 16' x 11' tents over wood frames and floors.

Buildings were designed with a maximum width of 10' for portability by truck :

Mess hall 10' x 40' w/attached "T" 10' x 20' kitchen

Cooks' quarters 10' x 22'

Shower house 8' x 20'

Tool house 8' x 10'

Seven 16' x 16' pyramidal tents over frames quartered the crew of twenty, the Camp Director and two Foremen. One tent was added to accommodate the crew of thirty for the second season in Lane County.

#### CAMP OVERHEAD

Based upon experience with the 20-man fire suppression crews, the Department used a Camp Director and two Foremen for each of the two camps.

Camp Directors in each case were school teachers, and in both instances did outstanding jobs of providing the on-the-ground leadership essential to the success of the camps. Glenn Hoff, an elementary school teacher in the Eugene system, was hired and used as Director both summers in Lane County. Louis Kelly, Director of Vocal Music at South Salem High School was Camp Director for the one season for the Marion County camp.

Camp Directors received a salary of \$460.00 per month less \$50.00 for board and were required to live at the camps.

Foremen were, in general, university students and in one case a rural school principal.

Foremen were paid \$400.00 per month less \$50.00 board.

A cook and an assistant cook were used at each camp to prepare meals seven days per week. They were paid \$337.00 and \$266.00 respectively, less \$50.00 board.

#### REGULATIONS AND RULES

Since this was a pilot program, a minimum of rules and policies were outlined by the Department for the Camp Directors. These were essentially as follows :

1. Crews would work on projects 8 hours per day, 5 days per week.
2. Crews would not leave general camp vicinity during weekends and off-work hours other than on organized excursions under supervision with the following exception :

One evening per week, either Friday or Saturday, the crews would be taken into town. They would be free of supervision until 11:00 P.M. (or until curfew hour) at which time they were to assemble at a designated point to meet truck and return to camp.

3. A fifteen minute break period was to be allowed morning and afternoons on project work.

4. Saturday mornings were to be devoted to camp cleanup.

5. Wholesome recreational activities were to be encouraged during off-work hours.

6. Crew was to wear protective helmets (tin hats) and be adequately clothed and shod when engaged on work projects.

7. Parents would be welcome if they wished to visit camps on weekends.

Details such as mess schedules, kitchen police, smoking rules, commissary, actual work hours, conduct and clothing during off-work hours were left to the Camp Director to work out at his discretion or with advice, if necessary, from Department personnel.

Instructions to boys prior to their reporting to camp detailed clothing and toilet articles which they were expected to provide. They were told not to bring pets, personal vehicles and firearms but were invited to bring musical instruments, radios, hobby materials, fishing gear, cameras and other miscellaneous items.

#### WORK PROJECTS

During both summers, the Lane County crew was kept busy principally on recreational types of projects. They cleared ground and constructed picnic tables, fireplaces and rest-rooms in the Blue Mt. Park Area, at Dorena Lake, and at Wildwood Falls on Row River.

To compare work projects from the standpoint of job satisfaction to the boys, the Marion County crew was put to work thinning and pruning a stand of second growth timber on State-owned land. This stand improvement work was completed on forty-five acres, and in addition two recreational trails were constructed to scenic areas as a secondary project.

Both crews were trained for the less hazardous phases of fire control (patrol and mop up) and thoroughly trained in safe working practices.

A tabulation and description of work projects by camp follows:

#### LANE COUNTY, 1961

Project	Man-days	Rate/day <sup>1</sup>	Total
1. Wayside picnic area.....	315	\$4.50	\$1,418
2. Stand improvement.....	205	4.50	922
3. Slash piling and road work.....	61	4.50	274
4. Trail construction.....	58	4.50	262
5. Camp completion.....	127	4.50	571
6. Training.....	56	4.50	252
Total.....	<sup>2</sup> 822		3,699

<sup>1</sup> Approximate daily rate for \$138 per month.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 40 workdays from July 10 through Sept. 1 plus 3 boys employed for 6 days prior to camp opening and 2 boys for 2 days to assist in closing the camp.

1. *Wayside Picnic Area*—Included clearing of heavy brush from two-thirds acre, construction of 12 picnic tables, five fireplaces and two rest-rooms.

2. *Stand Improvement*—Included thinning and pruning of thirty acres of young, uneven-age stand of Douglas-fir on county-owned land near camp.

3. *Slash Piling and Road Work*—Consisted of slash piling on approximately ten acres of commercially thinned area and installation of water bars on main road of the Blue Mt. Demonstration Tract.

4. *Trail Construction*—Consisted of clearing and construction of approximately one-half mile of trail on each side of Mosby Creek between the existing Blue Mt. Park and the new wayside picnic area.

5. *Camp Completion*—Included painting of buildings and tent frames, ditching for water and electrical lines, installation of privy-type rest-rooms and digging of garbage pits.

6. *Training*—Included one day on general safety and use of tools and two part day sessions on fire training.



## LANE COUNTY, 1962

Project	Man Days	Rate/Day	Total
1. Blue Mountain Park.....	\$550	\$4. 50	\$2, 475
2. Baker Bay.....	245	4. 50	1, 103
3. Wildwood Falls.....	151	4. 50	680
4. Demonstration tract.....	436	4. 50	1, 962
5. Training.....	135	4. 50	607
Total.....	<sup>1</sup> 1, 157		6, 827

<sup>1</sup> Includes 53 workdays, June 18 through August 31.

1. *Blue Mt. Park*—Included clearing of 5½ acres of brush and windfall, construction of 1½ miles of trail, construction of 14 picnic tables with benches, construction of four fireplaces and two rest-rooms, installation of crib supports and stringers for 140' bridge across Mosby Creek and laying of 700' of plastic water line.

2. *Baker Bay*—Included construction and placement of 240' boatdock; construction and installation of 10 picnic tables, two fireplaces and two rest-rooms and general cleanup of entire existing picnic and campground areas.

3. *Wildwood Falls*—Consisted of clearing of one acre of heavy brush for parking and picnic area and construction and placement of ten picnic tables, two fireplaces and two rest-rooms.

4. *Demonstration Tract*—Included brushing of 3½ miles of road and trail pruning of 25 acres of 40 year old second growth timber and pruning and thinning of 15 acres of reproduction, 10–20 years old.

5. *Training*—Included one full and three half day sessions on general safety and use of tools, one full day of fire control training and one full day on general forestry and park development and planning.

## MARION COUNTY, 1962

Project	Man days	Rate/day	Total
1. Stand improvement.....	514	\$4. 50	\$2, 313
2. Trail construction.....	238	4. 50	1, 071
3. Camp completion.....	158	4. 50	711
4. Training.....	70	4. 50	315
Total.....	<sup>1</sup> 980		4, 410

<sup>1</sup> Includes 52 workdays, June 19 through Aug. 31.

1. *Stand Improvement*—Included brushing and repair of one-half mile of access road and precommercial thinning and pruning of 45 acres of 40 year old stand of Douglas-fir plus removal of all brush species. This work was accomplished on State-owned land in Marion County in the general vicinity of the camp.

2. *Trail Construction*—Included brushing of one mile of road and construction of one-half mile of trail at Shellberg Falls and improvement of approximately one mile of trail and construction of one and one-half miles of new trail into the area of Butte Creek Falls.

3. *Camp Completion*—Consisted of painting camp buildings and tent frames, burying of water and drain lines and digging of garbage and toilet pits.

4. *Training*—Included one full day and two half day sessions on general safety and use of tools, one full day of fire training and one-half day session on basic principles of forest management.

## RECREATIONAL PROGRAM

Camps were provided with recreational equipment to include activities of softball, volleyball, horseshoes and table tennis.

Camp locations were chosen which provided the activities of swimming and fishing. Game Commission cooperation provided a plentiful supply of trout in the streams adjacent to each camp.

Miscellaneous activities included fly-tying and ham radio demonstrations, overnight hiking trips, singing, skits, outdoor barbecues, movies at camp and baseball games with local town teams.

A highlight of the 1962 season was the softball game between the Marion County and Lane County camp teams. The Marion County crew was taken to the Mosby Creek site on Saturday, August 18. The game was won, 14-13, by the visitors from Marion County, and this was followed by an outdoor barbecue and considerable visting and comparing of camps between members of the two crews.

COSTS <sup>1</sup>

Following is a cost breakdown for each of the three camps.

Capital outlay expenditures do not include vehicles since these were rented from the Department's motor pool.

*Lane County, 1961 (20 boys, 8 weeks)*

Salaries and wages:	
Supervision and construction	\$4,955.77
Crew and Cooks	4,287.92
Total	\$9,243.69
Other personal services:	
Civil service charges	\$139.59
Workman's compensation (SIAC)	165.80
Retirement contribution	105.37
Social security taxes	312.84
Social Security Administration assessments	18.90
Total	742.50
Materials and services:	
Office supplies	22.22
Vehicle operation	817.20
Foodstuffs	2,191.35
Dormitory and household supplies	571.74
Laundry	105.45
Medical and laboratory supplies	16.92
Buildings and grounds	550.69
Field and protective supplies	419.74
Miscellaneous materials and supplies	181.41
Accounting	35.49
Other professional services	34.50
Rental of equipment	10.00
Communications	99.04
Utilities	235.61
Postage	20.81
Meals and lodging (travel)	84.79
Total	5,396.96
Capital outlay:	
Dormitory and household equipment	2,369.45
Buildings and building fixtures	4,145.10
Field and protective equipment	726.61
Miscellaneous equipment	58.19
Total	7,299.35
Grand total	22,682.50
Total Lane County costs	6,605.24
Total State costs	16,077.26
Total	22,682.50
Cost per boy with 10-year amortization of capital outlay equal	805.00

<sup>1</sup> Costs for Lane County, 1961, are final, those shown for Lane and Marion County camps for 1962 are total through September 30, 1962, and will be within \$300.00 of final cost.



*Lane County, 1962 (30 boys, 11 weeks)*

Salaries and wages:	
Supervision -----	\$4,354.54
Crew and cooks -----	7,977.66
Total -----	<u>12,332.20</u>

Other personal services:	
Civil service charges -----	56.15
Workman's compensation (SIAC) -----	275.04
Retirement contribution -----	114.72
Social security taxes -----	475.55
Social Security Administration assessment -----	20.00
Total -----	<u>941.46</u>

Materials and services:	
Office supplies -----	6.06
Vehicle operation -----	734.02
Foodstuffs -----	4,135.09
Dormitory and household supplies -----	138.68
Laundry -----	121.21
Buildings and grounds -----	157.01
Field and protective supplies -----	90.65
Miscellaneous materials and supplies -----	63.47
Accounting -----	20.69
Communications -----	74.36
Utilities -----	46.64
Meals and lodging (travel) -----	2.50
Total -----	<u>5,590.38</u>

Capital outlay:	
Dormitory and household equipment -----	398.44
Buildings and fixtures -----	115.75
Field and protection equipment -----	409.87

Total -----	<u>924.06</u>
-------------	---------------

Grand total -----	<u>19,788.10</u>
-------------------	------------------

Total Lane County costs -----	12,418.75
Total State costs -----	7,369.35

Total -----	<u>19,788.10</u>
-------------	------------------

Cost per boy with 10-year amortization of capital outlay (1961 and 1962) equal -----	
	656.00

*Marion County, 1962 (20 boys, 11 weeks)*

Salaries and wages:	
Supervision and construction-----	\$6,048.25
Crew and cooks-----	5,535.92
Total -----	<u>11,584.17</u>
Other personal services:	
Civil service charges-----	39.48
Workman's compensation (SIAC)-----	213.34
Retirement contribution-----	59.53
Social security taxes-----	384.74
Social Security Administration assess-----	17.00
Total -----	<u>714.09</u>
Materials and services:	
Office supplies-----	17.02
Vehicle operation-----	1,174.58
Foodstuffs -----	2,460.31
Dormitory and household supplies-----	819.48
Laundry -----	71.16
Buildings and grounds-----	450.95
Field and protective supplies-----	443.30
Miscellaneous materials and supplies-----	224.99
Accounting -----	14.96
Rental of land-----	100.00
Rental of equipment-----	28.00
Communications -----	1.10
Utilities -----	33.78
Postage -----	11.98
Total -----	<u>5,851.61</u>
Capital outlay:	
Office equipment-----	19.61
Dormitory and household equipment-----	1,994.28
Buildings and fixtures-----	3,802.69
Field and protective equipment-----	452.41
Total -----	<u>6,268.99</u>
Grand total-----	<u>24,418.86</u>
Total Marion County costs-----	8,184.85
Total State costs-----	16,234.01
Total -----	<u>24,418.86</u>
Cost per boy with 10-year amortization of capital outlay-----	939.00

## COMMENTS &amp; ANALYSIS

Everyone closely associated with the pilot Summer Camp Program was convinced that the boys left the camps with a healthier attitude toward society and life in general.

To the majority of the seventy boys who participated, the camps perhaps provided a first opportunity to do something worthwhile and therefore to feel useful and wanted.

The work projects provided the opportunities for learning to work with hands and tools as individuals and in cooperation with others for that feeling of a worthwhile job well done.



Recreational activities provided an outlet for leftover energy for relaxation.

Job satisfaction to the participants appeared to be greater with the recreational development type of project. In this type of work, the crews cleared the areas of brush, constructed the picnic tables and benches, fireplaces and rest-rooms; a few days' work produced something that was almost immediately valuable and useable.

Timber stand improvement work proved to be somewhat monotonous, and its value is of course in the future. Training sessions aimed toward an understanding of the value of this type work were helpful but did not entirely relieve the monotony of limbing trees, cutting brush and thinning out the stand.

A variety of work of different types seems most desirable, but most important is the factor of completely finishing any project which is started. From this completion, the pride of accomplishment is very apparent.

Camp facilities provided for the pilot program proved to be adequate and not over elaborate. Thirty boys did somewhat overcrowd the mess hall and shower facilities during the second summer in Lane County.

Twenty-five participants per camp of this type should perhaps be maximum.

Supervision at the camp consisting of the Camp Director and two foremen proved adequate for directing work and recreational activities.

Provision was made to elevate two or three of the boys to straw-boss level during the summer with a ten dollar per month increase in pay. This provided an incentive for additional effort and for leadership recognition.

Three boys were returned to the second Lane County camp from the first camp to act as straw-bosses. This appeared to be a less desirable arrangement than selecting or promoting to straw-boss from within the crew.

The program certainly cannot be a cure-all for school dropout and delinquency problems. The Department could operate one or more summer camps in cooperation with each county of the State each summer and still be only scratching the surface of the apparent need.

It does however offer a way to favorably influence some boys who have problems and to accomplish needed expansion in the field of recreational facility development and forest improvement work.

To date, the Lane County Parks Commission has not placed a value on the work accomplished by the two summer crews.

The work of the Marion County crew for the 1962 summer on State-owned land is estimated as follows:

Timber stand improvement: 45 acres at \$40 per acre-----	\$1, 800
Trail construction: 2 miles at \$1,500 per mile-----	3, 000
Trail improvement: 1½ miles at \$150 per mile-----	225
Road improvement: 1½ miles at \$200 per mile-----	300
Total-----	5, 325

Total cost of Marion County Camp including one-tenth of capital outlay: \$18,777.

Thus the cost of the program appears justified only if the intangible values are placed on the scales.

What is it worth in dollars to the counties and the State if 60 of the 70 participants complete high school who would not have without the booster provided by the experience?

What is it worth in dollars if one or more of the participants is diverted from the road to MacLaren School or the Correctional Institution?

These are questions beyond the area of knowledge of the forester.

D. L. PHIPPS,

*State Forester.*

By C. D. MAUS,

*Assistant State Forester, Services Division.*

Mrs. GREEN. We have one small project in Multnomah County and I am under the impression that it is coordinated with NYC. Do you know if there is any connection with the one in your county?

Mr. SWANSON. There is no connection but I understand the one in Multnomah County was operated through the intermediate education district and I think it included children of a younger age and it was

geared more to exposing them to other outdoor experience than it was to-work experience.

They have some very good pictures on this that I have viewed and as I recall they were a younger age group.

Mrs. GREEN. I think the only disagreement I would have with you would be at the bottom of page 1. I am not sure that the cost-benefit ratio could not be as accurately measured as we do in any of our public works projects.

I think we really demonstrate by cost and analysis that the cost-benefit ratio of this kind of investment would bring greater returns than almost any other program on which we could embark.

Mr. SWANSON. I am not sure I disagree with you. I certainly think your point is well taken. My question is how are we able to measure it in dollars?

Mrs. GREEN. I think one way of measuring it is the amount that Uncle Sam collects every April 15 and the increased benefit to the Federal Government because the life is making a contribution to society.

I just want to express my thanks along with my colleague from Oregon, Mr. Dellenback, and tell you how grateful I am, as one citizen of Oregon, for your outstanding contributions in the field of education.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you very much, Mr. Swanson. I feel we are all very impressed with your testimony.

Our next witness will be Mr. Michael Frome, who is the conservation editor of Field and Stream magazine.

#### **STATEMENT OF MICHAEL FROME, CONSERVATION EDITOR, FIELD AND STREAM MAGAZINE**

Mr. FROME. I believe you already have copies of my statement, but there is one other document I would like to present to the members of the committee.

Mr. MEEDS. Welcome to the committee, Mr. Frome. I also read your testimony in the Senate hearings and I am greatly impressed with it. (Mr. Frome's statement referred to follows:)

#### **TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL FROME, CONSERVATION EDITOR, FIELD AND STREAM MAGAZINE**

I am glad to see this legislation, which proposes to establish a pilot program for a Youth Conservation Corps, considered before the Committee on Education and Labor, for conservation in its best sense is devoted to the human resource as well as to the land, or, more properly, in direct relation to the land. "The rightful use and purpose of our natural resources," as Gifford Pinchot, the foremost pioneer of modern conservation, explained, "is to make all the people strong and well, able and wise, well taught, well fed, well clothed, well housed, full of knowledge and initiative, with equal opportunity for all and special privilege for none."

In the pursuit of this concept, one may feel as though part of a great social movement that services all classes of people and appreciates their true needs, with faith in the intellectual capacity of people. Certainly the establishment of a Corps as envisioned in this bill affords our generation a chance to keep faith with the young, to show with deed that our legacy is not simply one of war and hate and environmental degradation, but of hope and confidence and peace.

It was the late Aldo Leopold, distinguished as both a conservationist and an educator, who declared, "I am glad I shall never be young without wild country to be young in." Preserves such as the national parks, forests, wildlife refuges and national resource areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management maintain the opportunity for successive generations to acquire the characteristics



of pioneers, to acquaint themselves firsthand with conditions that have shaped our culture. Such contacts are essential to the sense of being an American. That young people are shut off from healthful outdoor experiences undoubtedly contributes to the rising tide of crime and violence.

Adventures in the outdoors are essential to appreciating the mechanism of the land. The further we move from the natural ways of our ancestors and the further we withdraw into urbanized insulation, the more people do lose touch with their origins. A society that relies on sewers to carry away its offal, living in cities recklessly spewing waste into streams, can hardly understand its dependence on natural resources, or exercise much effort to protect them.

Thus I view the proposed Youth Conservation Corps as a basic investment in the country's future—one of the "growth stocks" of America, to use President Nixon's own expression. If I may say so, I am astounded to read and hear statements of opposition from Administration spokesmen and can hardly believe they reflect the viewpoint of the President himself.

H.R. 11145, introduced by Congressmen Meeds and Wyatt, and its companion piece in the Senate, S. 1076, sponsored by Senator Jackson, are quite modest. But modesty should hardly be confused with the scale of significance. The legislation may prove in the long run more constructive and beneficial than anyone anticipates, and perhaps in ways that we cannot presently conceive.

H.R. 11145 and S. 1076 would set up a corps of youngsters in the age group between 14 and 18 with summer work on conservation projects in our national lands, possibly in state and county areas as well. Funding would be in the amount of three million dollars a year for a trial period of three years, though I feel this should be extended to five years in order to assure a fair and full test.

It is a mistake to discuss this program in the same frame of reference as either the Job Corps or the CCC. Despite the proven achievements of those projects, the objective at hand now is a different one. For one thing, the age group is younger.

For another, the work of building fire trails, planting trees, conserving soil and developing recreation areas is not the goal in itself, but rather the means, through useful summer employment, of generating understanding of the individual's role in the greater world around him. I would like to think the Youth Conservation Corps will be the spawning ground of the environmentalists of tomorrow. Brains are emphasized more often than brawn, but both are required. We need specialists of many backgrounds, all sharing a common understanding of the desirable balances between manmade and natural environments. I hope that youngsters may have the opportunity to exercise their aptitudes for painting and photography of the outdoors, of writing poetry about the natural wonders of the land, or of writing about conservation.

One other difference. Job Corps and CCC were designed to benefit the disadvantaged. The Youth Conservation Corps will bring together young people of diverse backgrounds. I believe strongly that the large majority of members should come from the financially underprivileged, for middle and upper-class families can afford to send offspring to summer camps and schools or on recreational travel to public parks and forests. But still the mixture will be beneficial in many ways in cementing understanding and cooperation among all people.

I vision this pilot program as a form of basic research in which young people themselves will be accorded considerable responsibility and opportunity for input. The greatest challenge of our generation is to foster the genius of the next. Let me give an example of what can come. A couple of years ago a new student-teacher came to Rabun Gap, an historic settlement in the mountains of North Georgia. As a classroom project he began a magazine called *Foxfire*—a written dialogue to rekindle the lore of the highlands before it was lost and forgotten. *Foxfire* gave the young a chance to sustain their heritage, which blossomed into something else, an attractive booklet called, "Where Have All the Flowers Gone?" Of contributions written by a dozen outside conservationists and educators, I quote from the one by Ralph Gray, Editor of the *School Bulletin* of the National Geographic Society, which goes to the heart of the Youth Conservation Corps question:

"In a world where thousands of acres of land are covered by concrete each year, it becomes increasingly urgent to save those areas of natural beauty that are left. Your efforts are praiseworthy from two standpoints: First, because the mountains where you work are blessed with species of plant life not duplicated anywhere else in the country; and second, because students are involved. The attempts of these young people to preserve the beauty around them are symbolic

of greater concern; and when the young people begin to care what happens to their world, that is a hopeful sign indeed."

Unfortunately, we missed the chance to get the Youth Conservation Corps started during the past summer, although hearings were held in the Senate in April and H.R. 11145 was introduced in May. I receive scores of letters from parents in behalf of their offspring, and from youngsters themselves, asking about summer job opportunities in the outdoors as part of their life's education. I am sure that members of this Committee receive as many, if not more, from your constituents, and the Departments of Agriculture and Interior are overwhelmed with applications for the few summer jobs available. In short, the program is overdue. The young people of the United States are ready and eager to go. Action for the good is what they crave. H.R. 11145 provides the opportunity to get rolling on the right road, and I therefore urge its enactment.

MR. FROME. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since you have my testimony, I am not going to try your time by reading it. Rather, I would like to use it as a departure. The publication I have given you, "Where Have all the Flowers Gone?" represents the work of a youth project in the mountains of north Georgia. I believe you will find it of interest. I would like to talk briefly about the youth crisis and the importance of this legislation in helping to solve it.

The young people are in trouble and the Nation is in trouble. A member of the committee from Texas, Mr. Collins, earlier questioned the feasibility of spending money on this project.

I don't see how we can avoid spending money in order to solve the pressing problem of our young people through sound, constructive work in the out of doors.

An item in this morning's paper, which you may have seen, reported of violence on the campus of the University of Texas. Young people there were endeavoring to protect the natural resources, growing trees. An item in Monday's paper reported how violence was committed on the banks of the Potomac, where young people were endeavoring to protect the scenic resources of the National Capitol from the desecration of a wicked and unnecessary bridge project.

On the other hand, I can report to you of a personal experience when I went to a football game at Fort Hunt High School in suburban Virginia, which my two children attend. A friend and I parked our cars on the parking lots of the church across the road; when we returned after the game the windows of both cars were smashed, by young people, of course.

Violence is in the air. I predict it is in the offing on a large scale unless Congress and the administration take action to channel the energies and the desires of the young people to be involved and to do things.

The only quotation I would like to make from the publication that I gave you is the following written by Ralph Gray, editor of the school bulletin of the National Geographic Society which goes to the heart of the youth conservation corps question:

In a world where thousands of acres of land are covered by concrete each year it becomes increasingly urgent to save those areas of natural beauty that are left. Your efforts are praiseworthy from two standpoints, first, because the mountains where you work are blessed with species of plant life not duplicated anywhere else in the country and second because students are involved.

The attempts of these young people to preserve the beauty around them are symbolic of greater concern and when the young people begin to care what happens to their world that is a hopeful sign indeed.



I can assure you that I am aware as conservation editor of *Field and Stream* as the author of books on the national forest and the national parks of the problems of the great outdoors.

I can also assure you that I am aware of the problems of camps for the privileged and the underprivileged. I send my two kids to the finest music camp in the Nation in Michigan.

It is an expensive proposition and it grieves me deeply that we don't have the adequate mix of the advantaged and the disadvantaged and the affluent and the impoverished to which Mrs. Green addressed herself previously.

I would be glad to answer any questions or provide any other information you may desire.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you very much, Mr. Frome.

Without objection Mr. Frome's prepared statement will be entered in the record prior to this oral testimony.

I am particularly impressed with your statement beginning at the top of page 2 which says: "It is a mistake to discuss this program in the same frame of reference as either the Job Corps or the CCC. Despite the proven achievements of those projects, the objective now at hand is a different one. For one thing, the age group is younger."

I am very happy that you picked up that concept. As Mrs. Green so properly pointed out yesterday, young people become mental dropouts from school at 12, 13, 14, and 15 years of age.

They may be physically in class but that is all. This bill addresses itself to that age group. Is that what you mean?

Mr. FROME. This is precisely so, Mr. Meeds. I think if we were really serious we would map out for our young people a total introduction, indoctrination, and continued training in environmental matters starting from their tender years in school and bring them into the out-of-doors of our national lands as this bill provides at the age of 14.

This is precisely what I meant. Unless we train our people to be environmentally aware the environment in the United States is doomed.

Mr. MEEDS. I am glad you said that because you also noted in your statement, again on page 2, and I am quoting, "I would like to think that the Youth Conservation Corps will be the spawning ground of the environmentalist of tomorrow."

And in this connection I don't know if you have seen it, Mr. Frome, but in the *New York Times* of Monday, October 20, is an editorial by Robert Bendiner who is a member of the editorial board of the *Times* which addresses itself to precisely the issue you have raised.

I would ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the record after your testimony.

Mr. FROME. It is always a pleasure to find the *New York Times* agreeing with us. I don't think of this project just in terms of commercial thinning and building trails and other work of that nature I think the kids should have a chance to express themselves.

I allege myself to be a barefoot intellectual. I think if the kids want to go out and learn how to write poetry this should be part of their opportunity and part of our responsibility to provide the resources for them to do so. If they want to learn photography or paint pictures, this, too, can be a lasting contribution.

I think a materialistic and mechanistic society is not what the young people want or need. They crave intellectual and spiritual exercise—the President addressed himself to this question yesterday at the prayer breakfast.

I think this bill affords an opportunity to achieve fulfillment of the President's stated goal.

Mr. MEEDS. I am tremendously impressed with both your prepared statement and your extemporaneous remarks.

I will yield to the gentlelady from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think your words are very, very eloquent. I particularly like your reference on page 1 to the growth stocks which I think is relevant to the question I asked a moment ago on the cost-benefit ratios because I think we can determine it.

Mr. FROME. The President used that term, and said there are two areas that should not be cut in the budget: one was education and the other conservation.

This was last year during the campaign.

Mrs. GREEN. I don't want to get into any discussion this morning with my colleagues so I won't comment. But I agree with that and I hope we will follow through.

In reference to the bill, I do think legislation of this type could be among the most significant legislation we have ever adopted in the Congress.

This leads me to a question which frankly I have not thought through. I would like your comment. You said you thought most of the youngsters should be disadvantaged but you were opposed to limiting it to the disadvantaged.

You went on to comment that wealthy families could afford to send their sons and daughters to camps. What would be your reaction to a program that would be open to everyone but if parents wanted to pay or were in a position where they could pay that they would pay the expenses?

This at first may sound unfair but we do this in the school lunch program which is really essential for youngsters. Those youngsters who can afford it pay and arrangements are made so that the disadvantaged can receive the lunch free without embarrassment.

It would enable us with a limited budget to make this kind of an opportunity available to all.

Mr. FROME. Off the top of my head, I would say it merits further study. The main thing is that we should insure that there is the mix. I prefer to see the predominant number from the lower economic levels who do not have the wherewithal to go to nice camps which do exist in the United States.

I think it is worthy of study. It is a possibility. I would want to consider it further.

Mrs. GREEN. I agree the economically disadvantaged can't send their children to camps but there are lots of families I know of in the middle income that you don't yet understand the importance of a camp for their youngsters and do not make that distinction.

So I think it should not be a program designed for the economically disadvantaged.

Mr. FROME. This is perfectly so, but I think we who are lucky enough to live in suburbia have our little bits of nature around us.



Where I live in Mount Vernon our kids go boating; they have a lot of things that the kids in the inner city are never privileged to touch. I have my own little wilderness at home.

Mrs. GREEN. Maybe not making it economically disadvantaged but have it a program designed for inner city youth.

Mr. FROME. Well, there is a lot in that, too. I think we should be thinking of a broader and more comprehensive program to train kids in environmental awareness and to work with nature as way of life in the United States, of which this legislation is an important component.

But I would like to see us again in the beginning with kids as they first go into school to have programs to go out and touch nature where they are to bring nature to them.

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I recently asked for some information on the number of acres that are lost each year to pavement and asphalt.

The research division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported to me that 50,000 to 100,000 acres each year are irretrievably lost to pavement and asphalt, and even of this amount at least 50,000 acres were previously cropland which makes this kind of a program so important as we become a more and more urban society.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEEDS. The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I thank you, Mr. Frome, and welcome you. I would ask if you feel that there should be people taken into this program from all walks of life as indicated, since the funds that would be involved in this certainly might not take in everybody who might be interested, how would you go about suggesting we make the initial selection? How would you establish the priorities?

Mr. FROME. I would establish committees of selection based on offices in the agencies involved, the Park Service, Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife working together with groups that are in this field already, such as the Student Conservation Association and also possibly Outward Bound.

I think I would establish an application system and do it on a regional basis, assuring that there were so many young people from each region and have regional selection committees to meet with them in order to make the selections on the basis of need, qualifications, desire, and the date of the application. I would also try to have those who were rejected placed in some other situations.

I recall one of the members of the committee spoke earlier about private contributions and developments in this field. This should be encouraged and efforts made to place young people who cannot be accommodated in other camps.

This would be my suggestion.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You indicate in your testimony that you visualize the goal is to obtain an understanding of the individual's role in a greater world around him, as you put it.

You don't see it, I suppose, as being contradictory to this idea of actually developing and improving recreation areas, do you?

I read your testimony as not talking about primarily making a summer camp out of these programs, but rather using what may be long

and hard work in the environment as a method not only of improving and enhancing the environment but also trying to develop understanding?

Mr. FROME. This is correct. I am sure coming from the area of the Nation that you do, we can talk about the principle of multiple use. I believe in multiple use, one phase of this happens to be wilderness.

So I think that a great deal of good can be done for the land and for the kids through participating and enhancing and enriching the lands for their use and for the use of their children still to come.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You would not see this in any way used exclusively for young men, I suppose?

Mr. FROME. No, I believe in integration of the sexes as well as the races.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And you are fully aware of the feeling that many of us have, that young ladies are sometimes as much in need of this type of enrichment as are young men?

Mr. FROME. I can't think of what a man would ever do without a woman. In conservation work we find that some of the real sparkplugs are the women. They carry the torch with passion and conviction.

Mr. DELLENBACK. It is not only in the field of conservation, Mr. Frome. Thank you very much, Mr. Frome, I think this is helpful testimony. We appreciate your testimony.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you again, Mr. Frome.

(The document referred to follows:)

[From the New York Times, Oct. 20, 1969]

#### MAN—THE MOST ENDANGERED SPECIES

(By Robert Bendiner)

Young Americans, like all the young who have gone before them, are doubtless struck by the fact that they have been brought into a world they are sure they never would have made. It is probably not the best of all possible worlds, to be sure, and perhaps it might not even make the list of the ten best in the universe.

All the same, it will not do to demonstrate, as the middleaged are tempted to do, that a disappointing heritage has been the lot of succeeding generations ever since Cain and Abel came into a world that would have been a paradise if people over thirty hadn't spoiled it. For the past is brushed away as irrelevant, including the fact that Cain, for one, didn't make things any better.

#### THE NEW CRUSADE

What is new, relevant, and hopeful is that a kind of crusade is now on to undo at least the physical damage inflicted on this earth by the half-dozen preceding generations and that the very effort promises at last to unite today's contending generations in a single cause. Call it conservation, the environment, ecological balance, or what you will, it is a cause more permanent, more far-reaching, than any issue of the day—Vietnam and Black Power included. Fortunately, it too is attracting young idealists, and its successful pursuit will give the youth of some far-off future reason to feel, uniquely, a twinge of gratitude toward its forebears, though no sophisticated forebears-to-be will count on that.

#### ELEMENTS OF CHALLENGE

The scope of the challenge, the opportunity for work and devotion and energy—as well as the possibility of visible reward—are barely suggested by the following bits of information, all recently recorded:

*Water.* The Interior Department reports that more than 15 million fish were killed last year by municipal and industrial wastes in America's rivers, lakes and streams . . . For ten miles south of Albany the fish of the Hudson River are



not affected because they disappeared long ago, unable to survive in water that would sear the paint off a ship's hull. . . . Lake Erie is sick with decay and probably beyond the chance of recovery . . . Several urban rivers, like the Cuyahoga, which runs through Cleveland, are thick enough with inflammable wastes to be considered fire hazards . . . Senator Mondale of Minnesota, "The Land of 10,000 Lakes," complains that hundreds of them "are decaying and in danger of becoming extinct." But most of the waters of the earth can be restored, and this generation of elders has started to do it.

*Earth.* Because of the ignorant and irresponsible way coal and iron were mined in the United States for more than a century, two million acres of land, in 28 states, are cracking, subsiding, and sinking into the ground, occasionally taking houses and automobiles with them, and another million acres will go by the end of the century. Underground fires—one blazing since Christmas Eve, 1915—continue to discharge noxious gases daily.

The affluent societies of the world are in a fair way to choke the good earth, as well as the seas, with the waste material they discard. Every man, woman and child in the United States generates an average of five pounds of refuse a day. Monstrous automobile graveyards, sometimes four and five layers deep, compete for the traveler's eye in rural New England as well as the back lots of Cicero, Ill. Maybe some of these mountains of waste could be fitted into those abandoned mines, serving at once to extinguish the fires and to shore up the caving earth. If not, there is a possibility of breaking them down for re-use, no mean challenge in itself.

*Air.* During the last century man has contrived to raise the carbon dioxide content of the entire earth's atmosphere by some 10 per cent. There is limit beyond which such a change, assuming it doesn't first choke us all to death, will alter the earth's climate, with unpredictable but distinctly unattractive possibilities. . . . If man does manage to hold the carbon dioxide level within life-sustaining limits, he will nevertheless have to cope with an increasingly acute health hazard or wear an oxygen mask on earth as well as on the moon. A recent analysis shows that simply by walking the streets of his city for a solid day, a New Yorker would breathe in the toxic equivalent of close to two packs of cigarettes.

#### A Goal for Youth

The point of all this is not to terrify, but rather to demonstrate what idiocy it is to imagine that today's youth has no goals to excite it and nothing in common with its elders. In all too sober fact it faces, along with the rest of the population, a crisis generated long ago and one greater than all the war emergencies of history rolled together. Just to get man off the list of endangered species should take all the character there is to spare in the rising generation, their children, and their grandchildren—if any.

Mr. MEEDS. Our last witness this morning, but not the least significant is Mr. Lloyd Tupling of the Sierra Club. He is well known to this subcommittee.

#### STATEMENT OF LLOYD TUPLING, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SIERRA CLUB

Mr. TUPLING. I know the time is short, and I would like to present my statement as written and try to summarize some of the points.

Mr. MEEDS. Without objection your prepared statement will be entered at this point in the record and you may testify extemporaneously.

(The statement referred to follows:)

#### STATEMENT OF THE SIERRA CLUB

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am Lloyd Tupling, Washington representative of the Sierra Club, a national conservation organization with about 82,000 members in 29 chapters throughout the United States. The Sierra Club was founded 77 years ago by the naturalist, John Muir, and his associates "to explore, enjoy and preserve \* \* \* scenic resources of the United States and its forests, waters, wildlife and wilderness \* \* \* to educate the people with regard to the national and state forests, parks, monuments, and other natural resources of

especial scenic beauty and to enlist public interest and cooperation in protecting them."

Purposes of the Sierra Club are, therefore, very much aligned with objectives of the Youth Conservation Corps legislation now pending before the Committee. We see in H.R. 11145 and S. 1076 policies and purposes which will implement both the protection of natural resources and the education of young people about their environment and heritage of natural resources. The Sierra Club has for many years had a volunteer youth activities program aimed at acquainting young men and women with the physical, environmental, social and political forces which affect natural resources of the nation which they are to inherit. Much will be gained by establishment of the Youth Conservation Corps because there is a need for participation in these programs by all elements of the public and private sector of American life before young people are resigned to treeless horizons and concrete paths.

The Sierra Club has found among young people a deep and abiding interest in protection and wise use of our nation's resources. Young people have been a vital part of the reforestation projects and the camping and recreation clean-up programs conducted under Sierra Club auspices. These work projects cannot help but instill an understanding of good citizenship. Anyone who has gathered the trash and tin cans left by careless campers cannot help but develop concern for Nature. A young man who plants trees on a barren hillside gains respect for the husbanding of resources.

There is a vast backlog of work that could be accomplished by young men and women in our forest, park, recreation and wildlife areas. For many years, funds for land and water conservation purposes have been far below demands on our nation's recreation facilities. As population expands, this pressure will increase. The Youth Conservation Corps could help to fill this breach. At the same time, meaningful work experience would be made available for young Americans, many of whom are trapped in an unproductive urban environment.

The disaster which Americans must continually patrol against is the reckless and speedy consumption of our natural resources by our own waste and profligacy. The resources we now possess are all that we will ever have. It is of utmost importance that the youth of America know of the need for conservation practices. Those who work fulltime in the conservation movement are mindful of the need for more participants. The Youth Conservation Corps can well provide new impetus. The manifold environmental problems we face require all the assistance and dedication that can be made available.

The Sierra Club supports favorable action to establish the Youth Conservation Corps.

I thank you for the opportunity to present this statement.

Mr. TUPLING. The purpose of the Sierra Club is research in line with the objectives of the Youth Conservation Corps legislation.

We see in H.R. 11145 and S. 1076 policies and purposes which will implement both the protection of natural resources and the education of young people about their environment and heritage of natural resources.

The Sierra Club has for many years had a volunteer youth activities program aimed at acquainting young men and women with the physical, environmental, social and political forces which affect natural resources of the Nation which they are to inherit. Much will be gained by establishment of the Youth Conservation Corps because there is a need for participation in these programs by all elements of the public and private sector of American life before young people are resigned to treeless horizons and concrete paths.

I would like to interject at this point, Mr. Chairman, and make reference to an article which appears in the current September issue of the Sierra Club Bulletin about one of these trips that we conduct, made up of young people, for back packers.

On this particular trip they went into little Yosemite for 3 days and collected 101 burlap sacks of garbage.



I would like to add that these work party trips have been sponsored by the club since 1958 and we found them very successful in cleaning up park and recreation areas and developing the needed trails in the forests.

I would like to have this article appear at the conclusion of my testimony if that is possible.

Mr. MEEDS. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. TUPLING. The Sierra Club has found among young people a deep and abiding interest in protection and wise use of our Nation's resources.

Young people have been a vital part of the reforestation projects and the camping and recreation cleanup programs conducted under Sierra Club auspices. These work projects cannot help but instill an understanding of good citizenship.

Anyone who has gathered the trash and tin cans left by careless campers again cannot help but develop concern for nature. A young man who plants trees on a barren hillside gains respect for the husbanding of resources.

Mr. MEEDS. The gentlelady from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much. I just wanted to welcome Mr. Tupling to these committee hearings. He is a longtime resident of Oregon and certainly one of the most eloquent spokesmen for conservation and also legislative assistant to a former Senator from Oregon.

So I am delighted that you are here and that you individually do support this legislation.

Mr. TUPLING. Thank you, Mrs. Green.

Mr. MEEDS. The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you. I also join in welcoming you, Mr. Tupling. All of us on the committee are aware of the situation of the Sierra Club and I am personally very pleased that it is speaking out on issues like this because you speak for a substantial group of people who are dedicated to some very worthy goals. I think that this legislation is well worth our careful consideration in this regard and frankly is enhanced by the strong position that you have voiced on behalf of the Sierra Club.

I appreciate your taking the time and giving us the benefit of this very worthwhile testimony.

Mr. TUPLING. Thank you, Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. MEEDS. I just have one brief question. Have you had an opportunity to read the editorials of the New York Times on Monday, October 20, by Mr. Van Dine?

Mr. TUPLING. No, I have not seen that.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Van Dine, and I hope I am doing him justice makes the point that the youth of this Nation indeed is very concerned about the environment and that it has a cause and that the responsibility of enlisting young people in that cause is truly one we ought to be looking for.

Will you first of all agree with his premise and secondly if you do, do you think this bill is a step toward fulfilling that premise.

Mr. TUPLING. Oh, yes, I quite agree with the conclusion that young people are looking for constructive things to do. They have a very deep concern for environmental problems. I have no doubt that the Youth

Conservation Corps would provide an outlet—a catalyst—for really creating the development of this feeling that young people have.

Mr. MEEDS. The Sierra Club has been a national leader in certainly the establishment and maintenance of wilderness areas and national parks. Do you feel there are positions and opportunities for young people to enhance the value of these Federal lands to our society, and to be enhanced themselves by having had a part in doing this?

Mr. TUPLING. Yes, the experience we have had with our own youth trail maintenance parties and cleanup parties indicates that there is a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done.

These young people are willing to do it. For instance, last year we had a reforestation project just 2 days, Saturday and Sunday, and I think some 12,000 trees were planted by 150 young people that came out from San Francisco.

They had a good time and it was of great benefit to the area and to them.

Mr. MEEDS. Wouldn't you agree with me that this type of reforestation program in a wilderness area or in a national park will enhance that area as well as the people involved in it?

Mr. TUPLING. Yes, I have no doubt about that.

Mr. MEEDS. Would you further agree that even if this were to be done on a commercially managed national forest land that it would help provide the supply of softwoods we need and secondly, also, to help lessen the pressure to log off areas primarily used for recreation.

Mr. TUPLING. Yes, I think that is one of the things that really needs to be done. We need to improve the understocked and poorly stocked areas that are in the national forests and this is one way it could be done.

As you point out, if we develop more fully the productive commercial lands, or lands that could be productive if they were properly reforested and maintained, then there would not be this demand to go and cut down the virgin forests that many of us believe should be protected for park and recreation services.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you very much.

I could not agree with you more. Thank you for appearing here today.

(The article referred to follows:)

[Article in Science Club Bulletin, September 1969]

#### TRIP No. 103

We didn't laugh much on the way up the trail. It was hot and our packs were heavy. Then, too, we didn't know each other well. Half the fun was watching a lone guitar change hands along the trail. By the time that instrument made camp late that night it had become the unifying element of the group. Music and wilderness do not always mix, but Bob Dylan couldn't have done a nicer job at the strummed-out nightcaps of a young curly-haired singer. She wasn't awfully pretty. She might be if she lost weight. Molding each other, she and guitar became one. No one talked when she sang. We just kept adding wood to the fire.

"Why did I come? Well, I had some free time at the end of the summer and wanted to go to the mountains. My brother had been on a Trail Maintenance trip before and really loved it, so I thought I'd come on a clean-up trip. I wanted to meet people, too. When you're in the mountains for a week you get very close to people. My parents dropped me off and here I am."

We worked one day and played the next. The beauty of the trip was in the cleaning up. Everyone helped. We smashed cans, picked up litter, garbage and broken glass. We erased all traces of old campfires and overturned fire-blackened



rocks. We cleaned for refuse under bushes, in open meadows, and on lake bottoms. The trash collecting gradually became a game. (The bits of junk people leave behind can be hilariously funny if the altitude is high enough and the collectors have a sense of humor.) There was satisfaction in the job, too. To see litter along a wilderness trail and to walk past without doing anything about it can be frustrating. But to backpack with thirty-four companions into beautiful country with one purpose in mind—to clean it up—can be amazingly gratifying. It's an immediate step towards putting right the things that are wrong; It's also a way of getting close to fellow cleaner-uppers.

There was only one person, a girl, left in camp the second day of work.

"It's funny. I thought I was going to have to work all day and I've been playing the guitar and reading the whole afternoon. The cook wanted the afternoon off and someone had to stay and guard the commissary. The marmots won't leave it alone for a minute." She hummed softly to herself. It was breezy and the tune flew into the wind.

A lot of people who saw us working wanted to know why we were cleaning up. Were we being paid, how often did groups do such a thing, were we going to be in this spot very long? When we told them the purpose of the trip, and of the organizing force responsible for our being there, most gave understanding nods. They offered thanks and some wanted membership information. They were quick to inform us that the trail was filled with rocks and needed clearing. As the trip went on, we even did trail maintenance work.

At night we talked. Sierra nights are cool and the best place to be was close to the fire.

"Yes, I have a twin sister," said a boy as he flipped his hair from his eyes and straightened his glasses that had broken that morning. "When we were born my parents got a free washer-dryer set from G.E. It was a publicity kick where G.E. offered 'twin' sets to every set of twins born on a certain day in September. Our doctor held us up till then. G.E. lost a lot of money 'cause doctors all over the country did the same thing."

Mt. Whitney stood only seven miles above camp and its challenge faced us all the time. Many licked it. We hiked to nearby lakes and lush meadows and some boulder-hopped through parts of Inyo National Forest. Glissading was fun, although declared off-limits. And every day was hot enough to test the lake water that only days before had been covered with a thin sheet of ice.

"Umm, yea. I got pretty scratched up. Geez, I'm so mad at myself. I got going fast and couldn't stop before the snowfield ended. I flipped over and bumped my head on a rock. I don't think it's very deep. I had Jennifer look at it. If it's still bleeding in the morning I'll ask Kevin what I should do."

The group was young and it was easy to see they felt at home in the high country. Everyone on the trip had backpacked before and for many wilderness was a household word. The air was clean and delicious to breathe. Every day brought a sky of deep, deep blue and nights were bright with a full moon reflecting off granite walls. Quiet places were easy to find and we often crept away to secret spots, nourishing the stillness of aged rock.

"It's so strange when I first walk into my house after a trip. Everything seems closed in. Out here there is space to move around. At home walls seem silly and the T.V. box makes me groan."

Twice a day we gathered around the commissary for meals. In one sense we were guinea pigs. All of our food was freeze-dried, which is a rarity for work party trips. Rumor had it that the store where fresh food was ordinarily purchased was closed the day the commissary shopped for supplies, so they bought dried food instead. Our leader explained, however, that we were testing the feasibility of a proposal for 1970 trips. One type of clean-up trip would offer the traditional fresh food packed in by mules, and the other would entail extensive backpacking, with each person sharing part of the load. This type of trip would permit hikers to cover greater distances, and because large quantities of trash are not always concentrated in small campgrounds, work parties would be able to cover miles of trail not yet touched by clean-up crews.

"I'm not even worried about the future. I may be a doctor and work in the country someplace. There is a shortage of small town doctors and you can get exempted for it. There are all kinds of ways to get out of the draft. I only know I'm not going to go."

It was Whitney's second clean-up in only four years. In 1965 a group collected 60 sacks of trash. We collected nearly 50, but ran out of sacks and turned to trail maintenance work. Our trip ended Labor Day and, because Mt. Whitney

registered more visitors than on any other weekend of the year, a lot of our work was probably undone. Even clean-up trips—that exist for one reason—cannot clean everything. The Forest Service latrines that were falling apart roof, floor, and walls couldn't be helped much. No doubt heavy winter snows were the main causes of destruction. But with the camping area as badly overused as it was sanitation conditions were appalling.

"It's inevitable! They'll have to outlaw cars from city streets during rush hours within the next twenty years."

"Yea, I know. Why should some guy drive a big, fat car on the road when he takes up the same amount of space in which twenty people could fit on some kind of public transportation, like a bus or smething? They could improve buses and then cars wouldn't have to stink up the air."

More than just hikers appreciate clean-up trips. The National Park Service and Forest Service budgets are limited for trail repair and clean-up work. In Idaho the Forest Service foots the entire cost of packing for Trail Maintenance parties, figuring they save many times that amount. They take charge of packing out all collected trash. A story goes, however, that a clean-up worker returned to a spot he had helped scour a year before only to find the same burlap sacks sitting in the spot where they had been left a year ago.

"My blisters don't hurt anymore. They popped and are okay." The hiker carefully removed her socks and examined her taped heels. "Dad said it would save money if I had one pair of boots for both hiking and skiing. I just didn't have time to break them in before I came."

The trip passed quickly. Bundled sacks lay at trailheads all over the Whitney area. After our final play day we headed back to San Francisco on Interstate 80. It was dark and we were tired after the day-long drive. One sunburned hiker caught the mood—we knew the trip was over.

"Have you heard about plans to build a boat harbor and marina on the ocean near the Audubon Wildlife Sanctuary?"

"Wow, you're kidding. That place is beautiful."

"Right. A lot of people are really up tight and the local Sierra Club people are fighting it. You know, there are lots of conservationists in that area. I hope they win. I think there is going to be some sort of public hearing pretty soon."

—E.R.

Mr. MEEDS. The Select Subcommittee on Labor will be adjourned pending further consideration of this legislation.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned subject to call of the Chair.)

(The following statements and letters were submitted for the record:)

COMMENTS ON THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS AND H.R. 14260 BY  
CONGRESSMAN RICHARD T. HANNA

I appreciate the opportunity the Select Subcommittee has given me to file views on the proposed Youth Conservation Corps. I believe the proposed Corps fills a much neglected vacuum and I am pleased to see the Subcommittee give this legislation the expeditious treatment it deserves.

As many of the Members already know, I have also introduced legislation which seeks to accomplish many of the same goals outlined in the bills considered during your recent hearings. However, my measure, H.R. 14260, has some differences which I believe substantially strengthens the proposed Corps when compared to the version favorably reported by the Senate Interior Committee.

Two major objections were raised to the Senate bill during the hearings on S. 1076. The first objection was the length of service by the proposed Corpsmen. The Administration experts unanimously objected to limiting the Corpsmen's experience to just the space of a summer.

The second objection, although related to the first, concerned the costs versus the benefits. S. 1076 authorizes \$3.5 million annually to implement a "Summer Corps." Administration officials voiced their opposition advancing the argument that the cost exceeded the return, and in fact could prove more costly when supervisory time not considered was included in the total.



I had one additional objection of my own. One of the most extensive local youth conservation efforts currently being conducted happens to be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor. The Neighborhood Youth Corps involves thousands of young people in numerous conservation projects. Yet, nowhere in S. 1076 is any provision made to incorporate Labor Department activities into the Corps, nor is there any requirement for the Labor Department to participate in either the planning or implementation of the YCC. I believe this oversight to be a serious mistake.

The legislation I introduced on October 8, answers each of these three questions. At a later point in this statement I will review the approaches I have taken in regard to these questions. First I would like to set forth my arguments for a Youth Conservation Corps constructed in the manner outlined in H.R. 14260.

There are essentially three arguments that persuaded me to introduce my YCC bill. This is not to say that I am not in firm agreement with the representatives of the major conservation organizations. I do agree with their views. However, the thrust of most of the favorable testimony suggested that the most important reason for initiating YCC was the impact it would make on the young people who participate. No doubt this is important. There are three other compelling arguments for YCC and it is these arguments I wish to stress.

Until it was brought to the attention of the Senate Interior Committee, no provision had been made for disadvantaged youngsters. Although the Senate Committee did finally include a new provision in their reported bill which recognized the need to give the disadvantaged a special opportunity to participate, little emphasis was placed on this aspect of the YCC.

This is most unfortunate. Anyone following the current labor picture realizes we are soon going to be waist deep in a serious social problem. With unemployment increasing, and expected to increase for a number of months to come, we must ask ourselves what will be done with the literally thousands of unemployed youngsters the accelerated jobless rate will produce.

During the last week I placed a set of statistics in the Congressional Record which dramatically demonstrated the effects rising unemployment have on the young. For every point of increase in the general rate there is apparently a 10 percent increase in the youth jobless rate. Compounding this problem, the largest segment among the young unemployed are nonwhite, unskilled minority males. It can be seen from these very brief statistics that the group the increasing unemployment rate affects most is the group least able to afford such adverse circumstances. It is also the same group upon which the YCC should have its most profound impact.

I believe that the most socially useful, and efficiently productive direction the proposed YCC can take is to absorb a great number of these young people who are becoming the increasing victims of government policy. Everything said about the wholesome, meaningful, and constructive contact a young person can have while working on a conservation project must be doubled and doubled again for thousands who will find themselves, because of government policies, on the street—with no money—and little hope.

I cannot plead too strongly for a YCC that is first and most importantly an agency that gives hope to those without it. I can think of no more disastrous course for this agency than to make it subject to the accusation that it is being used as nothing more than an opportunity for "middle American" children to have an entertaining summer vacation.

The second argument that compelled me to introduce the legislation is my belief that our national forests are over administered and undermanaged. A vast bureaucracy has come into existence each with its own special jurisdiction and interest.

Let me cite a few interesting facts which will serve to highlight this point. Three Departments (Labor, Agriculture, and Interior) now are involved in conservation projects. The Department of Commerce is involved as well, but it is difficult to ascertain how many of its people are directly concerned with forest management.

The Agriculture Department of course administers the national forests which occupy some 187 million acres. The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for more than 450 million acres. Now, of course these are not the only agencies involved in forest management. We have bureaucrats from Commerce, Treasury, and an assortment of lesser agencies not worth listing. Everyone seems to be involved in administering our forest resources.

And that is exactly my point—everyone seems to be administering while there seems to be a surfeit of people out in the field. For example, Agriculture's Forest Service bulletin reports an employment force of some 20,000 of which "about 7,000 are professional foresters." The rest of the force is an "administrative . . . and other professions." When the various agencies begin overlapping administrative personnel the organizational charts become mind boggling and one must ask whether the proportion of desk administrators to field managers might show a disproportionate ratio.

Of course the YCC will not solve this organizational problem, but my proposal will do at least two things not presently evident. First, it will get the three principal agencies together to discuss at least putting young people into the field. Secondly, the YCC should substantially increase the number of bodies actually doing on the spot resource management. For if the present organizational nightmare of the forest management bureaucracy suggests a lesson it is that we are not taking full advantage of this natural resource.

This leads me to the third argument. In order to take full advantage of this precious resource we must have the manpower available to do the job. The manpower is not currently available. The proposed YCC should go a long way toward filling the gap.

With the demand for housing increasing, foreign competition at the door, and timber prices spiraling putting needed housing out of the range of lower income families it is imperative that forest management be upgraded and made a more important component of our domestic policy.

As I suggested earlier, the measure I introduced on October 8, H.R. 14260, answers many of the questions raised by the above arguments.

First, my bill incorporates the Labor Department into the program. The legislation establishes an interagency (Labor, Interior, Agriculture) group familiar with their respective youth employment projects. This group has the responsibility of recommending the details on implementing the YCC. I did this because I felt the Corps required the close cooperation and coordination of all three agencies if it was to start upon a firm foundation.

The second major feature of the bill leaves the length of YCC service open. Rather than confining it to any specific period I felt the length of service should be flexible in order to take into consideration such factors as the need for additional manpower for specific short or long range forest management projects, and secondly, the rate of youth unemployment. To confine by statute YCC service to a specific length is a mistake. The program must have a high degree of flexibility in this area.

The third feature of my bill concerns the formula for funding. Rather than authorizing new funds, H.R. 14260, directs the Interagency Group to examine current youth employment programs within the component agencies and report how funds already allocated for lesser priority programs be redirected to YCC. I am convinced that there is a substantial amount of money now being spent on similar efforts which lack central direction and purpose—therefore substantially blunting the impact these funds were designed to produce.

H.R. 14260 while preserving the concept of the YCC, is substantially different in detail than the other bills being considered. I do believe, however, that my bill answers the objections raised against the other bills, while at the same time strengthening the overall program.

---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., October 27, 1969.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,  
*Committee on Education and Labor,*  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your Committee has requested a report from this Department on H.R. 11145, a bill "To establish in the Department of Labor a Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes."

The bill provides that the Youth Conservation Corps would be composed of young men and women 14 through 18 years of age. They would be employed for periods not to exceed 90 days in any 1 year by the Secretary of Labor. Their employment would be without regard to Civil Service classification laws or regulations. Members of the Corps would be considered Federal employees only for purposes of the Tort Claims Act, and laws relating to compensation for injuries. Rates, hours and other conditions of employment would be determined by the



Secretary of Labor in consultation with the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior. The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to make appropriate provisions for transportation, lodging, and subsistence.

If the bill were enacted, experienced personnel would be needed to work with young people between the ages of 14 and 18 and to provide them with the necessary supervision. Additional staff with these capabilities would be required to successfully operate the youth conservation program. Because of present budgetary and personnel limitations, it would be extremely difficult to recruit such qualified people partially because of the temporary nature of their employment. Thus, while we support the objectives of the bill, our present departmental priorities dictate that any additional personnel made available must be used in other critical areas.

The Department also believes that the short term nature of the proposed projects, the fact that youths could not remain over 90 days, would mean constant change and substantially limit the learning experience. The participants would have to be assigned to the simplest types of activities which would not require continuity. The opportunity to develop a useful environmental orientation would be limited. This Department is concerned that the type of environmental exposure envisioned by the youth conservation program would not be realized under the present bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

LESLIE L. GLASGOW,  
*Assistant Secretary of the Interior.*

---

MAYOR'S COUNCIL ON YOUTH OPPORTUNITY,  
*Jersey City, N.J., September 4, 1969.*

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,  
*Union City, N.J.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Having been intimately connected with the youth of our city, I heartily support and endorse the aims of bills H.R. 11145 and S. 1076.

Although several steps have already been taken to alleviate the summer work problem for teenagers, I personally feel we have barely scratched the surface of this enormous problem.

In addition to the obvious benefits of doing something constructive and earning money, it may well be that the most important effect of these bills will be to stimulate a sense of pride in the youths themselves and in their country.

Sincerely Yours,

ROBERT E. WRIGHT,  
*Executive Director.*

---

#### STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

The National Association of Counties represents approximately 3,000 county governments located within the United States and has had a long time interest in programs of youth employment and the development of our natural resources and park and recreation areas. The National Association of Counties strongly endorses the establishment of a youth conservation corps, feeling that this concept offers assistance for the preservation and development of the Nation's natural resources as well as a program for youth employment.

Summer employment opportunities for the youth of this country in conservation programs on park lands, wildlife refuges, forest lands, streambeds and wilderness areas would provide a rich and rewarding alternative to summers of inactivity, boredom and frustration. What better way is there to conserve the human and natural resources of our nation than to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. Through a sheer failure to act, we are wasting irreplaceable natural resources at an ever increasing rate and, at the same time, there are thousands of young men and women who each summer want to work but cannot find jobs.

Even a preliminary investigation at the local level indicates that an extensive force of workers who can perform hard labor tasks, is urgently needed for the maintenance and development of county park and recreation facilities. The decade of the 1950's brought rapidly accelerating citizen demands for nearby family recreational facilities. In response to this citizen interest, the total number of county parks sharply increased from approximately 900 in 1950 to over 2,700

county parks in the early 1960's. During the same decade, the total county park acreage doubled to 430,707 acres and the "average" county park increased in size to 165 acres.

Citizen participation catapulted from 5,000 volunteers in 1950, to over 45,000 unpaid county recreation leaders in the mid-60's. In addition, 20,263 full-time employees worked on county parks and recreation programs during 1960.

On the ledger side, the expenditures by counties for park and recreation purposes was \$67 million during 1958 and even by 1962 these expenditures had doubled to \$122 million.

These statistics are impressive in telling the story of county government's response to the outdoor recreation challenge, but they do not reflect the tremendous backlog of hard labor jobs which are *not* being performed as the counties strain to provide additional, yet minimal facilities for increasing numbers of interested citizens. By economic necessity, the primary emphasis by the county level of government is upon acquiring nearby recreation lands, before their price becomes prohibitive, and upon developing minimum recreational facilities, so that these areas can be used and enjoyed today. Nearly every county park has a wide variety of hard labor jobs which need to be performed, but which are being neglected because of the pressures to acquire and develop useable areas before it is too late.

The statistics are clear. County government and, I dare say, State and Municipal governments could benefit from an expanded version of this bill. Our Association strongly endorses an expanded "partnership" version of this bill that would offer a cooperative approach by the Federal, State, County and Municipal governments in providing employment opportunities through constructive work projects which will develop our natural resources and recreational areas.

Our Association submits for the Committee's consideration, amendments which are enumerated at the end of this statement. Enactment of these suggested amendments would clearly spell out a Congressional intent of encouraging maximum and active participation in the Youth Conservation Corps program by the local levels of government. Thank you.

Suggested Amendments to H.R. 11145 (suggested language is italic).

1. (Page 1, lines 4-11 and page 2, line 1) —

Sec. 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth, under the Department of Labor in conjunction with its Federal manpower and job training program for youth, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other *Federal, State, County, and City parks, recreational areas and natural resources areas* creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage.

2. (Page 3, beginning line 14) —

. . . the Corps in their duties. *The Secretary of Labor shall have authority to enter into agreements with State and County governments (for purposes of this title "State" shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam and American Samoa) charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the natural resources of the Nation, and of developing, managing, and protecting recreational areas, whereby the enrollees of the Corps may be utilized by such governments in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such State or County governments, programs planned and designated by such governments to fulfill such responsibility. Not more than one-third of The Corps shall be available at any one time for utilization by State and County governments, pursuant to such agreements. Any such agreement shall provide that the State or County will defray one-half of all costs incurred with respect to any enrollees utilized by such State or County governments.*









## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 1076

Feb. 18, 1969	Sen. Jackson introduced and discussed S. 1076 which was referred to Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Print of bill as introduced and remarks of author.
May 12, 1969	Rep. Meeds introduced and discussed H.R. 11145 which was referred to House Education and Labor Committee. Print of bill as introduced and remarks of author.
May 19, 1969	Rep. Foley introduced H.R. 11412 which was referred to House Education and Labor Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
June 18, 1969	Senate committee voted to report S. 1076.
June 24, 1969	S. committee reported S. 1076 with amendments. S. Rept. 91-270. Print of bill and rept.
June 26, 1969	Senate passed S. 1076 as reported.
Dec. 19, 1969	Rep. Meeds introduced H.R. 15361 which was referred to House Education and Labor Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
March 17, 1970	House committee reported H.R. 15361 without amendment. H. Rept. 91-915. Print of bill and report.
April 21, 1970	Rules Committee denied a rule on H.R. 15361.
June 4, 1970	Rules Committee granted a rule for the consideration of H.R. 15361.
June 15, 1970	House passed S. 1076 with amendments with language of HR 15361.
July 6, 1970	Senate conferees were appointed.
July 9, 1970	House conferees were appointed.

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected to the office of Justice of the Peace for the year 1904.

1904



July 22, 1970	House conferees agreed to file conference report.
July 28, 1970	House received conference report on S. 1076. H. Rept. 91-1338. Print of conference report.
July 30, 1970	House agreed to conference report.
Aug. 5, 1970	Senate agreed to conference report.
Aug. 13, 1970	Approved: Public Law 91-378

Hearings: House Education and Labor Committee  
Hearings on H.R. 11145.

Senate Interior and Insular Affairs  
Committee Hearings on S. 1076.

1. ... ..	1000
2. ... ..	2000
3. ... ..	3000
4. ... ..	4000
5. ... ..	5000

... ..

... ..









91<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# S. 1076

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 18, 1969

Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. STEVENS) introduced the following bill;  
which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular  
Affairs

---

## A BILL

To establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture  
Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### 3 POLICY AND PURPOSE

4 SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employ-  
5 ment of American youth in the healthful outdoor atmosphere  
6 afforded in the national park system, the national forest sys-  
7 tem, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public  
8 land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the  
9 Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an oppor-  
10 tunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's

1 natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the  
2 purpose of this Act to further the development and main-  
3 tenance of the natural resources of the United States by the  
4 youth upon whom will fall the responsibility for maintaining  
5 and managing these resources.

6 YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

7 SEC. 2. (a) To carry out authorized programs with re-  
8 spect to the lands and waters referred to in section 1 of this  
9 Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the  
10 Interior and the Department of Agriculture a Youth Con-  
11 servation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps").  
12 The Corps shall consist of young men and women who  
13 are permanent residents of the United States, its territories,  
14 or possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not  
15 attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Inte-  
16 rior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ without  
17 regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or  
18 regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or  
19 maintaining lands and waters of the United States under  
20 the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary. Members of the  
21 Corps shall be appointed without regard to geographical  
22 location or economic status.

23 (b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of  
24 Agriculture shall determine the areas under their administra-  
25 tive jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out pro-



1 grams using employees of the Corps. The rates and hours  
2 and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall be as  
3 jointly determined by the two Secretaries: *Provided*, That  
4 members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal  
5 employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June 25,  
6 1948, as amended (28 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.), and the Act  
7 of September 6, 1966 (5 U.S.C. 8102 et seq.): *And pro-*  
8 *vided further*, That no member of the Corps may be em-  
9 ployed for a term in excess of ninety consecutive days dur-  
10 ing any one calendar year.

11 (c) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of  
12 Agriculture may provide for such transportation, lodging,  
13 subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may  
14 deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of  
15 the Corps in their duties.

16 (d) The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Ex-  
17 penditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not  
18 apply to appointments made to the Corps.

19 (e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to  
20 each Department such sums as are necessary to carry out  
21 the purposes of this Act.

91ST CONGRESS  
1ST Session

**S. 1076**

---

---

**A BILL**

To establish in the Departments of the Interior  
and Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps,  
and for other purposes.

---

---

By Mr. JACKSON and Mr. STEVENS

---

---

FEBRUARY 18, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior  
and Insular Affairs



of citizens' advisory committees to the President should be reviewed and rationalized.

Second, the White House needs an even greater capability to identify talent for appointive federal positions in both domestic and international departments and agencies. It is an unfair strain upon the chairman of the Civil Service Commission to serve both as director of the President's personnel operations and as the policy chairman of the major career service of the federal government.

Third, the operational aspects of the Office of Emergency Planning (for mobilizing the services of all levels of government to meet emergencies of war or natural disaster) and the Office of Economic Opportunity should devolve upon other agencies (the General Services Administration for Emergency Planning; HEW and/or Labor for OEO), although in the case of OEO extreme care must be taken to insure that the innovative and flexible characteristics of many of its programs are not destroyed by transfers to more traditional and conservative bureaucratic superiors. It should be possible for some civilian counterpart to the "Green Beret" or Marine Corps mission-oriented services, often competitive with more massive and sudden bureaucracies, to be established (and disestablished) within existing departments or as functions of independent agencies. The Executive Office of the President is not the appropriate rubric for these kinds of operating line activities.

Fourth, the staff competence within the Executive Office (presumably within the Bureau of the Budget) for studying and recommending structural changes and procedural improvements throughout the executive branch organization, on a continuing basis, needs to be strengthened in quality, size, and funding.

All of these are important addenda to the three essential areas of concern identified earlier. Progress along all of these lines can best be promoted by giving to the President effective control over the organization, staffing, and missions of the Executive Office of the President. If this is to happen, as we shall note below, the President must ask for and receive the understanding, support, and assistance of the United States Congress.

#### *Departmental structure*

One of the basic tenets of public administration is "span of control." In its simplistic form, at least in the federal government, it is a silly notion. The number of units reporting to a single administrator is not the essential factor in determining topside control. Ten units are too many if each has its own base of power in the legislature or in clientele groups of significant political influence. A hundred units are manageable if most of them lack an independent base of power, and if their mission is precise and low voltage. Little is gained or lost in terms of "good management" in the executive branch if the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, the American Battle Monument Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and the Panama Canal Company are allowed to continue as independent, free-wheeling agencies. Those who would tidy up the administrative structure of the executive branch by putting everything under four or five giant-sized superdepartments, or under fifteen of twenty economy-sized regular departments, on the ground that only then can the President enjoy a manageable "span of control," overestimate the importance of the precept and underestimate the difficulties of achieving intradepartmental, let alone interdepartmental, coherence in anything as complex and diffuse as the federal government.

This is not to say, however, that the present structure of departments and agencies is either logical or efficient. Some regrouping and much internal reorganization, espe-

cially at the bureau level, is patently necessary. But since both of these kinds of moves involve political headwinds of gale force, a President should pick and choose a few major objectives and should calculate his political rations with extreme care.

The difficulty is that across-the-board generalizations about federal departments and agencies are inherently dangerous or irrelevant. Some are probably too large and heterogeneous (for example, HEW); some are too small and/or clientele-oriented (Labor, Commerce, Veterans Administration (parts of Interior, Agriculture, and HUD)); some are too independent (certain regulatory commissions); some are too dependent upon Congress (Atomic Energy Commission, the Corps of Engineers, the FBI); some are miscast as cabinet departments (Post Office); some are too plagued with ingrown career service elitism (State); some lack the internal capacity or external support to generate and sustain high morale (Agency for International Development). A general diagnosis and a general therapy are, in short, effectively impossible.

It is possible, however, to raise questions about departmental and agency structure relating to at least two of the four overarching concerns of the President: environmental management and control, and human resource development.

This is not to say that is well in the field of administering national security policy and economic stabilization policy—though the administrative machinery in the latter field has functioned relatively smoothly in recent years. While space does not permit an extended discussion here of problems in the national security area, it must be noted that the overseas mishmash of federal agency representatives still escapes effective control by the ambassador in the field or by the Department of State in Washington. The inflow of information and intelligence by cable and pouch has long since passed the point of digestibility. Horizontal and lateral clearances absorb an unconscionable amount of time and effort and involve delays that are sometimes dangerous. Some of these difficulties defy organizational rationalization; others might be partially obviated by an appropriate delegation of authority to regional assistant secretaries of state and by a more elaborate and effective staffing of the office of the Secretary of State. In 1962 the Herter Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel recommended an executive under secretary of state, a further administrative option that deserves careful consideration.

On major and critical issues of foreign affairs the threat of apocalyptic consequences has a way of crystallizing small cadres of influentials under the immediate direction of the President. Emerging policies may not always be wise, and the ponderousness of the structure and the system of communications may at times create crossed signals of serious consequence (as when in 1966, peace negotiations with North Vietnam were reputedly shattered by the President's unrecalled prior approval of bombing selected targets near Hanoi). But after a decade of review of national security machinery, the Jackson Subcommittee, although it has recommended a number of incremental improvements, has found no magic formula for a major structural reorganization. All that can be said is that the importance of the issue suggests that urgent and continuing attention must be given to the adequacy of staff arrangements for serving the President in this area of preeminent executive concern.

On the domestic front some major structural changes may well be needed in organization. Those involving the Executive Office of the President have already been discussed. At the departmental and agency level, four questions especially warrant hard analysis and viable answers:

First, how can the management responsibilities of cabinet secretaries and the heads of important line agencies be strengthened without throwing a wet blanket on the morale, energy, and discretion of subordinate operating bureaus?

Second, how can a gigantic hydra like HEW be split up without losing the benefits that logically accrue from reviewing health, education, and welfare as interrelated programs and values?

Third, how can the rule-making power of independent regulatory commissions be more effectively related to the policy mandates assigned by Congress to the President and to departments and agencies without jeopardizing the integrity of the quasi-judicial role of regulatory commissions?

Fourth, how can agency functions be regrouped in the human and environmental resources area in such a way as to promote more coherent program planning and implementation without taking on more battles with vested interests than any single administration can afford?

Again, there are no simple answers to any of these dilemmas, but certain directions seem more promising than others.

On the first question, the essential controls of an agency head over constituent units are three, and only three: (1) control of legislative proposals; (2) control of budgetary totals; and (3) control of major personnel appointments and assignments. Each department secretary and agency head should have a staff, a management information system, and adequate legal and political authority to develop and maintain competence in these areas. The staff need not be large, but it must be highly competent and must be supported with a flow of information that will enable it to present rational policy alternatives to the agency head. With these tools of general, overall management at his disposal, an agency head can delegate to line subordinates a substantial amount of operating discretion. He can also be equipped to serve the President and the Congress in their roles of making politically accountable decisions. Many departments lack the staff, the information system, and the legal and political authority essential for responsible management. The President should urge, and Congress should support, reforms leading to the improvement of this condition.

On the second question, there is probably more to be gained than lost in splitting up HEW. The issue is not the number of employees; Defense, Post Office, Agriculture, and the Veterans Administration all have a larger civilian work force. The issue is the heterogeneity of constituent functions, the size of the budget (HEW's budget is five times greater than the next largest civilian agency), the extensiveness of mandated intergovernmental relations, and the limitations that the present structure imposes on attracting top-grade personnel to man programs of extraordinary national consequence—education, for example. A separate Department of Education would not only symbolize the importance of the federal government's commitment to an essential and growing public function; it would serve as a rubric for gathering together at least some of the educational activities being carried out by departments and agencies outside of HEW (for example, National Science Foundation, OEO, Veterans Administration, National Humanities Foundation, Bureau of Indian Affairs). A Department of Health and Welfare should have no more difficulty in relating to a Department of Education than HEW presently has in relating its disparate activities to cognate functions in HUD, Labor, OEO, in the human resource development area; or to Interior, Agriculture, and the Corps of Engineers in the area of environmental management and control. Granted that these difficulties are substan-



tial, a strengthened program planning and implementation capacity in the Executive Office of the President could more than compensate for any loss in integrating functions now lodged unsuccessfully in the top echelons of an overgrown HEW.

On the rule-making authority of certain independent regulatory commissions, the analyses and advice of the Cushman Report (part of the Brownlow Committee study, 1937) and of the First Hoover Commission (1949) need rereading and studied implementation. America will never have a coherent transportation policy until the rule-making functions (making general legislative mandates specific) of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Maritime Commission are integrated with the policy responsibilities of the new Department of Transportation. America will never have a coherent power policy until the rule-making functions of the Federal Power Commission and the Atomic Energy Commission are consolidated with those carried out by the Department of the Interior. There have been until now sufficient political barriers to changing the structure and functions of independent regulatory commissions to raise serious questions about the viability of new or reiterated recommendations. But the problem is real, and there are no inherent difficulties in separating rule making from the quasi-judicial functions (making judgments about the legality of activities pursued under laws and rules) of regulatory agencies, preserving the integrity of the latter while making the former subject to responsible and coordinated political control.

The fourth question, on the regrouping of agency functions in the human and environmental resource areas in the face of vested interests, is the toughest. It can be answered in practice only by sophisticated management studies buttressed by executive-legislative concordats. In the absence of major structural changes, some experiments in establishing multiagency operational task forces under the command of presidential designees might well be undertaken—at least where target problems are fairly precise and short-term.

#### EXHIBIT 3

#### NIXON TASK FORCE URGES CREATION OF TOP-LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS POST

(By Peter Kihss)

President-elect Nixon has received a strong recommendation for naming a Special Assistant for Environmental Affairs, working out of the White House for the first time to dramatize concern over increasing pollution.

"The real stake is man's own survival—in a world worth living in," one of 10 task forces he named on domestic planning has reported to Mr. Nixon in an opening report that said Federal performance in the field thus far had been "disappointingly low."

"The gap between need [as indication by authorized funding] and appropriations in the air and water pollution abatement programs is critical and growing," the task force advised Mr. Nixon.

"For example, in fiscal 1969, in the water pollution control program, there is an authorization of \$836-million, an appropriation of \$302.8-million and a possible demand in available state and local matching funds of \$1.2-billion," it was stated.

The initial report was submitted to the President-elect last Saturday in New York by a 20-member Task Force on Resources and Environment, headed by Russell E. Train, president of the Conservation Foundation.

On that same day Mr. Train was reported to be under consideration for the post of Under Secretary of the Interior and was briefing the Secretary-designate, who is Gov. Walter J. Hickel of Alaska.

#### DETERIORATION CITED

Urging that "improved environmental management be made a principal objective of

the new administration," the task force cited "progressive environmental deterioration," including the following:

"The poisoning of our lakes and rivers, the pollution of our air, the changing carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere, the progressive deterioration of the organic fertility of our soils, the pesticides and other chemicals that permeate our living environment, visual ugliness and urban sprawl, the growing inhumanity of our cities, the rising tide of human numbers that threatens to overwhelm us and our civilization."

The group said it was not suggesting any "mammoth new programs" but rather putting emphasis on "performance—on making existing programs work."

While noting that "a host of conservation-environmental legislation" had been enacted, it said the disappointing performance had "a similarity here to the civil rights and poverty fields."

Appointment of a special assistant in the field, it was said, "would give the President for the first time a means of effectively influencing environmental policy across a wide range of agencies."

The new office, it was suggested, would "deal with the problems of compartmentation and conflict—often between Cabinet officers—that arise constantly in resources and environmental matters."

#### LIAISON FORESEEN

The new assistant, the report went on, should work closely with the President's science adviser, the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and the Budget Director.

It was also proposed that the new assistant be executive secretary of a new President's Council on the Environment, which would represent a broadening of the present inter-agency Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty.

The task force proposed that Vice President-elect Spiro T. Agnew serve as chairman of the reconstituted council "to provide leadership superseding the interests of any single department."

"Federal programs with major environmental impacts, such as highway construction," it was said, "should take into account the side effects, such as air pollution, which are the program responsibility of completely separate agencies. Present structure and, more important, present practice are grossly inadequate in this respect."

A supplementary paper on pollution asserted that "appropriations should be brought up close to authorizations" in Federal programs, but suggested that it would be better to reduce authorizations rather than let states and localities delay action "in unwarranted hope of Federal contributions."

#### SUGGESTION ON COSTS

This suggestion for possible Federal cuts drew a note from one task force member, Lelan F. Sillin, Jr., president of Northeast Utilities in Hartford, Conn., that it "should be eliminated."

The report's discussion of difficulties in tax incentives for reducing pollution or effluent charges as a means of control drew adverse comment from another member, John H. Meier, executive aide of Hughes-Nevada Operations, of Las Vegas, Nev.

Mr. Meier's comment was that "most of the polluters involve large-scale industry" and "should be required to carry the burden of removing the danger to the rest of the environment."

"If sufficient standards are set to guarantee public health and the enforcement is not interfered with by special interests who lobby against regulation rather than spend money on cleaning it up, the problem can be solved," Mr. Meier wrote.

Other task force members include:

Edward A. Ackerman, executive officer, Carnegie Institution.

Stanley A. Cain, professor, University of Michigan.

Charles H. Callison, executive vice president, National Audubon Society.

Joseph L. Fisher, president, Resources for the Future.

Loren V. Forman, vice president, Scott Paper Company.

Charles H. W. Foster, consultant, Conservation Foundation.

Maurice K. Goddard, Secretary of Forests and Waters, Pennsylvania.

Norman B. Livermore, Jr., Secretary of Resources Agency, California.

Charles F. Luce, chairman, Consolidated Edison Company.

H. Byron Mock, Salt Lake City lawyer.

Bernard L. Orell, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Company.

Nathaniel P. Reed, conservation adviser to Governor of Florida.

S. Dillon Ripley, secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

Laurence S. Rockefeller, chairman, Citizens Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty.

John O. Simonds, Pittsburgh landscape architect.

M. Frederik Smith, American Conservation Association.

John W. Tukey, Princeton professor and executive-director of Bell Laboratory.

#### S. 1076—INTRODUCTION OF YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS ACT OF 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. This program would be administered by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture with the objective of providing summer employment opportunities for the youth of this country in conservation programs on National Park lands, National Wildlife Refuges, National Forests, and areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management. This program would be open to young men and women of all socio-economic background.

As envisioned in the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1969, the Corps would be composed of young men and women 14 through 18 years of age. They would be employed for periods not to exceed 90 days in any 1 year by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. Their employment would be without regard to Civil Service classification laws or regulations. Members of the Corps would be considered Federal employees only for purposes of the Tort Claims Act, and laws relating to compensation for injuries. Rates, hours and other conditions of employment would be jointly determined by the two Secretaries, and each would be authorized to make appropriate provisions for transportation, lodging, and subsistence.

Mr. President, many of our Nation's youth—not just the underprivileged and the school dropouts—but also the average teenager often never have an adequate opportunity to be engaged in meaningful employment during the summer months. Because of the employment problems these young men and women face, especially in our urban areas, they are tempted to roam the streets in pursuit of less desirable goals. The Youth Conservation Corps could help correct this problem by providing an alternative. The alternative is employment. Jobs which would furnish



young people an opportunity to get off the streets and to engage in productive work and important learning experiences in our parks, forests, and our public lands.

This program is in some respects a preventive measure. It would offer many young people an alternative to the boredom and the frustration of inactivity which often arises during the summer recess from school. It would create an opportunity for young people to earn, to learn, and to work in meaningful programs which are important to their future and to the future of this country.

As members of the Senate are aware, once a young man or woman becomes a school dropout, once they have had a brush with the law, once their attitudes toward family and society take an anti-social turn, rehabilitation becomes an exceedingly difficult, expensive, and frequently unsuccessful task. It is appropriate that we should continue to improve and expand our rehabilitation programs. But, it is also important that we treat the root causes of boredom, anger and frustration by providing employment opportunities for our young people.

Projects which could be undertaken by members of the Corps include the maintenance and construction of campgrounds, bridges, trails, water control structures, picnic facilities, plus assistance in forest reseedling, timber stand improvement and other basic forest, soil and conservation and wildlife habitat measures. Time would also be devoted to teaching these young men and women the basic concepts of ecology, fish and game management, forest and range management, and other principles which would give them a greater appreciation and understanding of our Nation's great natural resources and the necessity for preserving and maintaining this great national heritage.

Knowledge and understanding are essential to the development of responsibility. It is my judgment that exposure to public service conservation projects could be a maturing, stabilizing influence for the young people of this country which would return benefits in later years that are now incapable of being assessed.

There is today a great backlog of conservation work of all kinds which must be reduced if we are to permit ourselves to believe that we are properly managing our natural resources. Present personnel and budgetary limitations have not permitted employment of sufficient staff to meet the increased demand for maintenance and services. Participants in the programs I envision could perform tasks within their capabilities, thus freeing permanent employees for other crucial work.

I also firmly believe that participation in this program would be both constructive and instructive to young people and, in many instances, would afford them an experience which many of the participants might not otherwise have.

The total benefits accruing from this program would far exceed just the tangible results of their work. These young men and women would return to their homes and schools with an understand-

ing of why a national park or a national forest is an irreplaceable national asset. Too many of our young people never see the side of America which our parks and forests represent. When they see the Federal Government in action firsthand, it is too often in the form of the military draft or some Federal regulatory activity.

In addition, these young people would return to their homes and schools with a sense of accomplishment for having bettered our environment, and a sense of involvement in this Nation's efforts to provide a quality life and quality surroundings for all Americans. They would acquire an appreciation for our natural resources and an understanding of our conservation programs which is not, and apparently cannot be, taught in our schools. In addition, they would develop good work habits and attitudes which would persist for the remainder of their lives.

For some, this experience might provide the incentive to look and work toward a rewarding career in natural resources and wildlife management or outdoor recreation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. As presently drafted, this measure represents only the bare outline of the concept I have in mind. I am sure that the executive reports on the bill and testimony at public hearings will develop many new ideas which will merit inclusion in the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1076) to establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. STEVENS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1076

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.*

#### POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth upon whom will fall the responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources.

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out authorized programs with respect to the lands and waters referred to in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who

are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ without regard to the Civil Service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary. Members of the Corps shall be appointed without regard to geographical location or economic status.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine the areas under their administrative jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out programs using employees of the Corps. The rates and hours and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall be as jointly determined by the two Secretaries: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (28 U.S.C. 2671 *et seq.*), and the Act of September 6, 1966 (5 U.S.C. 8102 *et seq.*), and *provided further*, That no member of the Corps may be employed for a term in excess of 90 consecutive days during any one calendar year.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the Corps in their duties.

(d) The provisions of Title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to each Department such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

#### ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS REPORTS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the claims of Alaska natives to the land and resources of Alaska have been a source of conflict between the State of Alaska, the natives, and the Federal Government for a number of years. In view of the interest expressed in this long-standing controversy, I am today releasing two reports on this problem which were prepared for the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee by the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska.

These reports were prepared at my request by the Federal Field Committee under the direction of its Chairman, Mr. Joseph FitzGerald. Together, they provide an excellent framework for subsequent discussions and hearings which should lead to a resolution of this long-standing problem by the 91st Congress.

The first report released today, "Alaska Natives and the Land," is a heavily documented and thorough 565-page study which brings together all relevant information on the land claims issue, the social and economic condition of the Alaska native, the resources of Alaska and the alternatives which might be followed in arriving at a settlement acceptable to all of the parties involved.

The second report is based on the first and is a proposal recommending the terms for a legislative settlement of the Alaska native land claims controversy.

As chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee I had re-



requested the Federal Field Committee to prepare both of these reports following the committee's field hearings on the Alaska native land claim issue in Anchorage, Alaska, in February 1968. I felt the reports were necessary because it was apparent that no one—including the Federal Government, the State of Alaska and the Alaska natives—had the basic information necessary to work out a wise and just settlement of this complex social, legal and political issue.

I am releasing the Federal Field Committee's report on legislative recommendations because it is essential that the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior, the State of Alaska and the Alaska natives all have an opportunity to carefully review the Field Committee's proposed settlement before bills are introduced and before the parties involved become locked into set positions.

The Field Committee's acceptance and completion of the assignment is an important innovation in executive branch service to a legislative committee. I wish to express my praise and gratitude to Mr. Fitzgerald and his staff of research analysts for conducting the study and preparing these excellent reports.

A very important precedent was established as a result of the Field Committee's reports. Too often the Congress acts on complex issues such as this without demanding that the executive branch develop and analyze all pertinent information.

The Field Committee's analysis stresses that consideration of claims legislation should be seen by Congress not only as a means of settling the legal claims, but also as an opportunity to provide a foundation for social and economic advancement of Alaska Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts, most of whom, according to the study, live under poorer circumstances than any other Americans.

The committee's study is the most comprehensive portrayal of the native people, the land, and the resources of Alaska ever assembled. In addition to serving the needs of the committee and the Congress for factual information relating to native land claims, it will be highly useful to the Congress and executive agencies in other matters affecting Alaska.

I am very concerned that a legislative settlement of the native land claims problem should not result in a repetition of some of the problems which have been experienced by the American Indians in the lower 48 States. A fair and generous settlement is required, but there must be provisions in the legislation which will insure that the native peoples of Alaska get the full and continuing benefits of the settlement, and that they be given a full and fair opportunity to attain quality lives for themselves and for their children.

Release of the Federal Field Committee's recommendations for the terms of a legislative settlement does not constitute an endorsement on my part or the Interior Committee's. It is clear, however, that these recommendations are based on a very thorough study and they cannot be dismissed lightly. Subsequent events may, however, require change. It is possible for example, that all of the parties involved may endorse and sup-

port a settlement which is different in some respects than that recommended by the Field Committee. I am hopeful that a final legislative settlement can be reached in the 91st Congress. Any further delay is not in the best interests of the people of Alaska, the State or the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that summaries of both reports and a brief biographical sketch of the authors be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the Field Committee's Proposal for a Legislative Settlement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### REPORT ON A PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE SETTLEMENT

The first bill on Alaska Native land claims was introduced in Congress in June 1967. When the 90th Congress adjourned, there were six bills pending. The settlement proposed in the Federal Field Committee's report draws heavily on these previous bills. It differs, however, in several important ways.

The proposal recommends grants of land in fee simple as well as protecting the Alaska Natives in their right to use the surface resources of the land for all present Native needs including hunting, fishing, trapping and other rights. The proposal seeks to resolve the potential conflict among individual Natives—urban and rural, those residing in resource rich areas and those residing in barren areas, and those who live in Alaska and those who live elsewhere—by providing a state-wide compensation package. Like those in some of the previous bills, this package is composed of lands, cash, and shared future revenues. Unlike earlier proposals, the Field Committee proposal places greater emphasis on money and revenue sharing as the primary form of compensation. (Although the report emphasizes money and revenue sharing as the primary form of compensation, an alternative proposal with land grants as the principle form of compensation is developed and could be followed.)

An adequate source of funds would be provided by opening more lands to competitive mineral leasing. These funds would not be distributed directly to Natives or to village groups, but would be channelled through one investment corporation owned by all Alaska Natives.

The grants of land proposed in the revenue sharing proposal are to individuals for their use or to legally recognized communities—not to tribes or bands or to other racially defined groups. Most existing Native reservations would be abolished. Specifically, the proposal would—

1. Give Native individuals the lands they use or occupy for homes, businesses, hunting, fishing, trapping, and reindeer management camps;
2. Provide for emergency protection for subsistence hunting and fishing on public domain lands;
3. Grant to any Native Village which incorporated under Alaska State law, up to 36 square miles of land for community use and expansion;
4. Grant to a new corporation, owned by Alaska Natives, \$100 million from the U.S. Treasury as payment for Native rights taken in the past; and,
5. Grant to the Native Corporation in compensation for rights extinguished by this legislation, 10 percent of the income from the leasing or sale of minerals and other resources from Federal lands for a period of 10 years, including lands selected by the State during the land freeze or after it is lifted.

The total lands granted in fee simple would range between 4 and 7 million acres, while the money payments would be a minimum of \$100 million, plus the sharing in Alaska resources up to a maximum of \$100 million each year for 10 years.

The Federal government would not make cash payments directly to Native individuals, but the corporation would pay dividends to Natives as stockholders out of the income from its investment; it could also make grants as loans to individuals, to communities, or to Native organizations. For the first 10 years the corporation would be managed by a board of directors, some of whom would be appointed by the President and others elected by the Alaskan Natives. During this 10 year period the management and investments of the corporation would be closely supervised by the Government. At the end of 10 years a new board of directors would be established, elected entirely by the corporation stockholders, and after a final review by Congress, all special supervision of its affairs would end.

The President would also appoint a five man Alaska Native Commission to supervise the enrollment of Natives eligible for a share of the settlement and the administration of land grants to individuals and communities.

#### ALASKA NATIVES AND THE LAND

The 565-page analysis of issues relating to the land claims, carried out by the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, urges prompt resolution of the aboriginal claims by a Congressional settlement emphasizing money compensation over land grants. The study notes that money is the most flexible form of compensation to meet the needs of both urban and rural claimants and suggests that Congress grant to them a percentage of future revenues from the resources of the land. It calls also for grants of land of up to one township for each village and grants of land to individuals and families for hunting and fishing camps, in most cases even if such sites are in federal withdrawals.

Behind the Committee's work lay these facts: Most of Alaska's 53,000 Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts—who call themselves "Alaska Natives"—are not residents of reservations, but instead live in 178 remote and isolated villages along the rivers and coastline of the state on federal land to which they have no established legal right. Of numerous claims filed by Native groups over the past thirty years with the Court of Claims or the Indian Claims Commission, only one has been adjudicated. While successive acts of Congress appeared to protect lands used by Natives, transfers to the state and others continued to take place. In late 1966 and early 1967 a flurry of new claims and protests by regional Native groups against the transfer of federal lands pushed the total acreage claimed to about two-thirds of Alaska's 375 million acres. Before the filings were complete, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall in December 1966, imposed a halt to the transfer of any federal lands to the state or any others in an area covered by a Native protest, explaining that transfers could resume once Congress defined the rights of Native claimants. While a few transfers of small parcels were made in the ensuing year with the permission of the claimant group, the "freeze" as it was called, brought an end to the state's program of acquiring the 103 million acres granted by the Statehood Act, and, in the opinion of the state, was acting as a brake on the economic development of Alaska.

In early 1967, the state filed suit against the Secretary of the Interior to compel a lifting of the freeze to allow the state's selection program to move ahead. The state's position was subsequently upheld and the case moved on appeal to a higher court. Meanwhile, four different legislative proposals were introduced in the Congress and made the



H. Y. 31125

A. 1011





91<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 11145

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 12, 1969

Mr. MEEDS (for himself and Mr. WYATT) introduced the following bill; which  
was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

## A BILL

To establish in the Department of Labor a Youth Conservation  
Corps, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3                               POLICY AND PURPOSE

4       SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employ-  
5       ment of American youth, under the Department of Labor in  
6       conjunction with its Federal manpower and job training pro-  
7       grams for youth, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded  
8       in the national park system, the national forest system, the  
9       national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and  
10      water areas creates an opportunity for understanding, and an  
11      appreciation of, the Nation's natural environment and herit-

1 age. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the  
2 development and maintenance of the natural resources of the  
3 United States by the youth upon whom will fall the respon-  
4 sibility for maintaining and managing these resources.

5 YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

6 SEC. 2. (a) To carry out authorized programs with re-  
7 spect to the employment of youth in the land and water  
8 areas referred to in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby  
9 established in the Department of Labor a Youth Conserva-  
10 tion Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The  
11 Corps shall consist of young men and women who are per-  
12 manent residents of the United States, its territories, or  
13 possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not  
14 attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of Labor may  
15 employ without regard to the civil service or classification  
16 laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of providing gain-  
17 ful employment, generating understanding, developing, pre-  
18 serving, or maintaining lands, and waters of the United  
19 States under the jurisdiction of the United States. Members  
20 of the Corps shall be appointed without regard to geographi-  
21 cal location or economic status.

22 (b) The Secretary of Labor shall consult with the Sec-  
23 retaries of the Department of the Interior and Department  
24 of Agriculture concerning the areas appropriate for carrying  
25 out programs using employees of the Corps. The rates and



1 hours and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall  
2 be as determined by the Secretary of Labor in consultation  
3 with the other above-named Secretaries: *Provided*, That  
4 members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal  
5 employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June  
6 25, 1948, as amended (28 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.), and the  
7 Act of September 6, 1966 (5 U.S.C. 8102 et seq.): *And*  
8 *provided further*, That no member of the Corps may be em-  
9 ployed for a term in excess of ninety consecutive days during  
10 any one calendar year.

11 (c) The Secretary of Labor may provide for such trans-  
12 portation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equip-  
13 ment as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs  
14 of members of the Corps in their duties.

15 (d) The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Ex-  
16 penditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall  
17 not apply to appointments made to the Corps.

18 (e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to  
19 the Department of Labor such sums as are necessary to carry  
20 out the purposes of this Act.

91<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

**H. R. 11145**

---

---

# **A BILL**

To establish in the Department of Labor a  
Youth Conservation Corps, and for other  
purposes.

---

---

By Mr. MEEDS and Mr. WYATT

---

---

MAY 12, 1969

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor



This succession of time periods permits the postponement of final action up to 14 months from the date of filing of the original petition. It is felt that 6 months for investigation and report by the Tariff Commission plus an additional 2 months for consideration and final action by the President affords adequate time to serve the purposes of the statute. Prolongation of final action by another 6 months can only be inequitable to industries which merit escape clause relief.

#### NARROWING THE DEFINITION OF "DOMESTIC INDUSTRY"

The foregoing amendments avail naught if in weighing "serious injury", the impact of increased imports is dissipated across a broad definition of domestic industry.

Section 3 of the proposed amendment would add a new subsection (7) to section 405 of the Trade Expansion Act to make it clear when an article is produced in a distinct part or section of a subdivision of an "establishment", even in a multi-establishment firm, that part or section will be considered an "appropriate subdivision" within the meaning of the Act for measuring injurious impact.

In an age of increasing conglomerate integration, it is necessary to give more attention to the "product line", and not to dilute the injurious impact of the imported article by spreading it over the non-related experience of the other divisions of the same business entity.

#### BLUE-COLLAR PAY BREAKDOWN

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a deplorable situation has developed in my home community of San Diego, and it is threatening to affect other parts of the Nation as well.

Last December 25, Christmas Day, some 13,000 Government workers in San Diego were due to get a pay raise. Today, nearly 5 months later, they still have not received it.

Reasons for the delay are varied and complex. It is difficult to point the finger of blame at any one individual or organization. But regardless of who, if anyone, is at fault, the hard truth is that 13,000 loyal, hard-working citizens have become the victims of a system over which they have no control.

These men and women are among more than 800,000 "blue-collar" employees of the Government. Their pay is determined, not by act of Congress, but by the prevailing industrial rates in the areas where they are employed.

Until very recently, industry has always cooperated with the Government in volunteering salary and other payroll information needed to set the pay scales for the blue-collar workers. Like most other working Americans, they have been able to anticipate with a fair degree of accuracy when they will get their increases, and to plan their budgets accordingly. I would add that with the inflation now rampant—the cost of living rose 4.6 percent last year alone—most of us need these increases on a regular basis just to stay even.

What has happened in San Diego—and is likely to recur elsewhere unless corrective measures are taken promptly—is that certain companies are refusing to

divulge data essential to the successful completion of these wage surveys. The reluctance of these firms stems from the new Federal wage board system which became effective last year and under which, for the first time, Government employee union personnel were assigned to the wage-survey teams making the comparative studies. This apparently stirred fears in the companies that sensitive job classification and salary range data might be turned over to the unions with which they must deal in negotiating contracts covering their own employees.

Information needed to complete the San Diego survey was actually turned over by the recalcitrant firms to the Defense Department—but on condition that it be held in confidence. When union representatives learned they were to be denied a portion of the data on which pay raise recommendations were based, they protested—and were upheld by Robert E. Hampton, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who ruled that such restricted information should not be used in setting the pay rates.

As a result of all the pulling and tugging of recent months, matters are pretty much where they were at the beginning of the year. The end of the struggle is not in sight, and the workers are deriving scant comfort from the assurance that the increases, when they do come, will be retroactive.

The situation would be bad enough if it applied only to San Diego. But ramifications of the impasse there are extending across the country. I understand that pay raises in cities such as Denver and Salt Lake City are being held up for the same reason. And a survey is due to get underway shortly in Los Angeles, where industries presumably will be guided by the same rationale as their counterparts in San Diego.

I should also point out that company resistance to union participation in the wage-setting process is not an isolated thing. Three San Diego firms have decided that the information for the wage board surveys should not be shared with union representatives. And two other manufacturers did provide the data to the wage-survey team but indicated this year would be the last time.

As I stated earlier, it is difficult to make and sustain accusations, despite the glaring injustice being done the workers. The companies understandably are concerned about compromising their position at the collective bargaining table, and the unions quite logically want to be part of the process for determining these rates.

But something has got to give. Most obviously, this system is not working. A tragedy is unfolding which apparently only Congress can prevent. I have taken the floor this afternoon simply to alert the House to the potential magnitude of the problem, and I stand ready to cooperate in every possible way with our Manpower Subcommittee in resolving it.

#### TO ESTABLISH A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the last several years have seen the Nation in turmoil, with racial and student problems part of our plague. A great deal of our mind and energy lately has been devoted to finding solutions which strike at the root of these pressing problems.

I am introducing today, along with Representative WYATT, of Oregon, a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. For sheer numbers, few unemployment statistics compare with those for young people. Last June a total of 1,600,000 were without jobs: This represents 16.5 percent of the young men and 23 percent of the young women desiring work. The tragedy of it is that these young people are not wanting a summer of relaxation, but rather are actively seeking work and coming away empty handed. The figures also show that employers prefer not taking chances on youngsters out for their first job. Thus the youngsters go idle, and we have all seen what their idleness brings during the summer months of vacation.

My bill is designed to do five things:

First, provide gainful employment for young people 14 to 18 during the summer months;

Second, place these young people in the healthy outdoor, working environment of national public lands and recreation areas;

Third, aid in the preservation and wise utilization of our natural resources;

Fourth, generate appreciation and regard for our great natural resources; and

Fifth, create understanding among the Corps members which should lead to mutual respect.

Central to these aims and a successful program is proper representation of a variety of social, economic and racial backgrounds. The attitudes of these young people 14 to 18 are still formative and malleable. The Youth Conservation Corps experience would be instrumental, and I think effective in keeping their minds open and responsive. We can little afford to bypass this great opportunity and lock out the ills of prejudice and misunderstanding. While I do not see this program as a panacea for all our social problems, the outgrowth would be lessening of tension: with a more healthy society, the long-run effect.

In addition to aiding our youth directly, the work of the Corps would preserve and enhance our national public lands and recreation areas. I am a cosponsor of another bill which seeks to ensure a meeting of our future timber needs. Part of the Youth Conservation Corps idea dovetails with that of the Timber Supply Act, as a means for extensive reforestation and improved husbandry of our timberlands. The corpsmen would aid our reforestation projects, and our reforestation projects would help the corpsmen.

My hope is that the program would begin as a pilot project at a modest level with approximately 3,000 participants and a price tag of about \$3,000,000 in the first year. One year should be sufficient time for the Corps to get on its feet, gain experience and prove its effectiveness. Subsequent years can bring expansion.



In the vein I have been talking, the conservation of natural resources has a double aspect: conservation of our young people and conservation of our great forests and public lands. Double returns for a single price.

#### NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of National Small Business Week, and I want to join with others in paying tribute to the Nation's 5 million small businessmen.

Our small businessmen are the key-stone of our economic system.

Our small businessmen are the watchmen on the walls of our great free enterprise system.

Our small businessmen are the guardians of competition, the heart and soul of our free economy.

Like the Biblical David the small businessman stands strong against the corporate giants that challenge his very existence.

Never before in history have our small businessmen been subjected to the competitive pressures they are experiencing today.

Chain stores, joint ventures, exodus to suburbia, urban renewal dislocation, discount houses, big business shopping centers, automation, electronic computers, and the general trend toward giantism remind us that the competitive status of the small-business segment of our economy must be constantly observed in order to maintain a truly competitive free enterprise system.

The Select Committee on Small Business—which I am honored to serve as chairman—is working constantly in many areas to assist small businessmen to cope with these tremendous problems. Our subcommittees and our staff are working daily on many areas to strengthen the hand of the small businessman and to assure him a free, competitive market.

The committee is following the mandate of the Congress:

It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel and assist and protect insofar as is possible the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise to assure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts or subcontracts for property and services for the Government be placed with small business . . . to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation.

During Small Business Week a number of outstanding activities have been scheduled. The National Advisory Council of the Small Business Administration will hold its annual meeting at the Mayflower Hotel, May 11 to 13.

Seventy-three members of the Council, representing all 50 States, Guam and Puerto Rico, will be present.

The National Small Businessman of the Year will be selected.

Simultaneously, at the State level, the Governor of each State will present an

award to his State's Small Businessman of the Year.

The Small Business Council is a voluntary group which analyzes the work of the Small Business Administration.

On May 14, the annual Small Business Subcontracting Conference and Workshop will be held.

The main theme of this meeting will be a report, prepared in response to a recommendation of the House Small Business Committee on "The Position of Small Business in Subcontracting."

This report was prepared by a special committee established by SBA and headed by a member of that agency.

This week declared by President Nixon is the Small Businessmen's Week. Let us remember their contributions in the national interest.

#### MILITARY BUDGET ALTERNATIVES RANGE FROM \$20 BILLION TO \$101 BILLION

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, 1969 is the year for an agonizing reappraisal of our national priorities, however, I charge that this reappraisal will amount to nothing unless we can find some way of controlling the \$80 billion military budget.

Recently, I have criticized the Defense Department on their questionable record in the procurement of certain major weapon systems.

The primary purpose of my effort is to develop in the Congress and in the public a healthy skepticism about the infallibility of the military.

However, I cannot emphasize enough that procurement is only the tip of the iceberg and we in the Congress have to critically examine—for the first time ever—the foreign policy commitments and contingencies that actually create the military budget.

To debate rationally the issue of the size and shape of the military budget we have to go back and reassess the mutual defense commitments that we have with over 40 nations in the world. Then we must evaluate our force structure—both strategic and general—which is necessary to meet our commitments. To my knowledge this has never been done on a systematic basis, in the Congress, since the end of World War II.

According to an excellent article by William Beecher in yesterday's New York Times, the National Security Council is now examining these questions to provide President Nixon with a range of meaningful choices. By varying the assumptions on which our strategic nuclear policy is based, preliminary estimates of these options range in cost from \$6 to \$16 billion annually for 10 years, compared to the present estimate of about \$10 billion a year. In the conventional forces area they have developed 10 alternative options, ranging all the way from "Fortress America" on one extreme to the United States as world po-

liceman on the other. In terms of dollars, the conventional force options run from \$14 billion a year to \$85 billion a year. Presently our forces in being cost about \$50 billion annually to maintain.

Thus the total military budget could vary from a total of \$20 billion to a total of \$101 billion—a difference of \$80 billion.

These 80 billions of dollars should be the subject of the congressional debate of the decade.

The critical question, it seems to me, is whether the Congress and the American people will get the benefit of being apprised of the alternative military policies that are available and the cost of these alternatives. The first reaction of the National Security Council is that the Congress will not be apprised of these alternatives. I suggest that the Congress demand the result of this study, so that we can—in the future—make our own evaluation of the military policy that now requires over half of our Federal resources.

I include the Beecher article at this point in the RECORD:

AS THE ADMINISTRATION REVIEWS MILITARY  
OPTIONS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—A new mood is taking hold in official Washington on the whole question of national defense and the resources committed to it. The mood, whether in the executive branch or in Congress, is one of reassessment, of realignment, of impending change.

Listen to two representative voices speaking last week.

The first is a senior defense official with long experience in the Pentagon:

"It was in the years immediately after the Second World War that the United States abandoned its traditional policy of noninvolvement and moved into a policy of collective defense and containment," the official began.

"We launched the Marshall Plan to restore Western Europe's economy, the Truman Doctrine to help defend Greece and Turkey, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to protect against the Soviet hordes. It was a turning point in our history as we moved into the world, making new commitments, picking up new encumbrances."

The official closed his eyes for a moment as he recalled the earlier era. "We had a great national debate in the Congress at the time. Now we appear on the verge of another, quite as historic."

Across town from the Pentagon, in a crowded Congressional office, an intense young lawmaker puts it somewhat differently but comes to a similar conclusion:

"I don't say we should disband our Army, disarm unilaterally and look only inward. But it's time we achieved a better distribution of resources. I, for one, am willing to assume larger risks by cutting back on defense, while assuming a larger burden of fighting crime and poverty and hunger and ignorance in America."

Though the words may vary, the sentiments of these two men are being heard increasingly around the nation's capital.

They have their echoes within the top ranks of the Nixon Administration on the part of some of those participating in a sweeping review of the nation's security policy and the forces necessary to fulfill that policy.

The study, under the direction of Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard, seeks to provide President Nixon with a range of meaningful choices.









# H. R. 11412

## MAY 19, 1969

# A BILL

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employ-  
ment of American youth in the healthful outdoor atmosphere  
afforded in the national park system, the national forest sys-  
tem, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public  
land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the  
Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an oppor-  
tunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's  
natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the

1 purpose of this Act to further the development and main-  
2 tenance of the natural resources of the United States by the  
3 youth upon whom will fall the responsibility for maintaining  
4 and managing these resources.

5 YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

6 SEC. 2. (a) To carry out authorized programs with re-  
7 spect to the lands and waters referred to in section 1 of this  
8 Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the  
9 Interior and the Department of Agriculture a Youth Con-  
10 servation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps").  
11 The Corps shall consist of young men and women who  
12 are permanent residents of the United States, its territories,  
13 or possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not  
14 attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Inte-  
15 rior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ without  
16 regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or  
17 regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or  
18 maintaining lands and waters of the United States under  
19 the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary. Members of the  
20 Corps shall be appointed without regard to geographical  
21 location or economic status.

22 (b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of  
23 Agriculture shall determine the areas under their administra-  
24 tive jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out pro-  
25 grams using employees of the Corps. The rates and hours



1 and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall be as  
2 jointly determined by the two Secretaries: *Provided*, That  
3 members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal  
4 employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June 25,  
5 1948, as amended (28 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.), and the Act  
6 of September 6, 1966 (5 U.S.C. 8102 et seq.): *And pro-*  
7 *vided further*, That no member of the Corps may be em-  
8 ployed for a term in excess of ninety consecutive days dur-  
9 ing any one calendar year.

10 (c) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of  
11 Agriculture may provide for such transportation, lodging,  
12 subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may  
13 deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of  
14 the Corps in their duties.

15 (d) The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Ex-  
16 penditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall  
17 not apply to appointments made to the Corps.

18 (e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to  
19 each Department such sums as are necessary to carry out  
20 the purposes of this Act.

---

# A BILL

---

To establish in the Departments of the Interior  
and Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps,  
and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. FOLEY

---

MAY 19, 1969

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor









Senate

-3-

June 18, 19<sup>69</sup>

6. WATER RESOURCES. Both Houses received from Interior a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. pp. H5021, S6625
7. BUILDINGS. Both Houses received from GSA a report on prospectuses which propose acquisition of space under a lease arrangement; to Public Works Committees. pp. H5021 S6625
8. FLOOD CONTROL; WATERSHEDS. Sen. Burdick commended the Tongue River watershed project and inserted an article, "Taming the Tongue--No Flood Waters in This Watershed." pp. S6636-7
9. GREEN THUMB. Sen. Fulbright inserted the "First Quarterly Summary Report for 1969 of Green Thumb Activities." p. S6637
10. INTEREST RATES. Sen. McIntyre stated that "if...the recent increase in the prime rate is not reversed, we...may have to consider legislation placing interest charges under Federal control." p. S6652
11. PESTICIDES. Sen. Nelson commended the Huntington Town Board, L.I., N.Y., on its banning the use of DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons within the town. pp. S6656 9
12. EDUCATION. Sen. Nelson commended the decision of the Appropriations Committee to restore the \$16 million to the educational opportunity grant program. pp. S6661-3
13. TRAILS. Sen. Mondale commended the national trails system and inserted an article describing the recreational opportunities which the trails system provides. pp. S6668-70
14. INFORMATION; EXPOSITIONS. Passed without amendment S. 856, to provide for Federal Government recognition of and participation in international expositions proposed to be held in the U. S. pp. S6624-5
15. EXPORT CONTROL. The "Daily Digest" states that a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee approved for full committee consideration an original bill in lieu of S. 1940 and S. 2390, to extend authority to regulate exports under the Export Control Act. p. D517
16. TRANSPORTATION; CLAIMS. The "Daily Digest" states that a subcommittee of the Commerce Committee approved for full committee S. 1653, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with regard to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property. p. D517

17. YOUTH CORPS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1076, to establish a 3 year pilot Youth Conservation Corps program in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture. p. D518

Received a GAO report on the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program in Grand Rapids, Mich. p. S6625

18. ENVIRONMENT. The "Daily Digest" states that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1075, to provide for studies and research in connection with national policy on environmental quality. p. D518

Sen. Baker inserted an article, "Can Man Survive? In an Artificial Environment." pp. S6646-8

Sen. Nelson recommended that the Governors of Minn. and Wisc. "immediately initiate a request to the Secretary of the Interior that intrastate pollution be declared a matter of conference jurisdiction." pp. S6653-4

19. RURAL AMERICA. In speaking of rural job development Sen. Hruska discussed an example, "Vision-17... a private corporation devoted to the economic development of 17 counties in southeast Nebraska," and inserted an article stating that aid to rural areas has to come from individuals. pp. S6652-3

#### HOUSE

20. CIGARETTES. Passed with amendments H. R. 6543, to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking (pp. H4939-64). Rejected an amendment by Sen. Cleveland to require the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the Congress on the financial assistance provided by the U. S. to the tobacco industry (pp. H4956-7). Rejected, 137-262, a motion to recommit the bill (p. H4964).

21. MILK. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 7996, to permanently extend the class I dairymen's base plan and authorize use of different base periods for allocating fluid milk utilization among farmers. p. D520

22. INTEREST RATES. Several Representatives debated the interest rate increase and Rep. Pickle announced that the Banking and Currency Committee will open investigations "to fathom the reasons why this Nation should suffer another increase." pp. H4965, H4965-6, H4966

23. TAXATION. Rep. Vanik expressed hope that every Member of the House who favors some alternative to the administration's tax proposal will advise the Rules Committee of the need for a rule which will permit an alternative vote. pp. H4966 7

Rep. Sisk called for a "tax reform package that has some meaning." p. H4967

Rep. Brown, Ohio, endorsed "tax incentives to industry if they install pollution control equipment." p. H4972



from title IV of the bill, "Limitations on Fiscal Year 1970 Budget Outlays," expenditures by TVA out of the proceeds from its power operations.

Pending at adjournment was Javits amendment No. 40 (for himself and others) to increase by \$47.5 million appropriations for Manpower Development and Training Act until September 30, 1969.

Pages S 6686, S 6691-S 6708, S 6709-S 6722, S 6729-S 6731

**Confirmations:** Senate confirmed nominations of Harold F. Faught, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, and James J. Needham, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Page S 6739

**Nominations:** Senate received the following four nominations to be Ambassador: John G. Hurd, of Texas, to Venezuela, Joseph Palmer 2d, of Maryland, to Libya, Adolph W. Schmidt, of Pennsylvania, to Canada, and Terence A. Todman, of the Virgin Islands, to the Republic of Chad. One Army nomination in the rank of general was withdrawn.

Page S 6731

**Record Vote:** Four record votes were taken today.

Pages S 6705-S 6706, S 6711, S 6718, S 6721

**Program for Thursday:** Senate met at noon and adjourned at 6:48 p.m. until 11 a.m. Thursday, June 19, when it will continue consideration of H.R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriations, to be followed by S. Res. 85, sense of Senate respecting commitments to foreign powers. It was agreed that Senate will also meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, June 20.

Page S 6686

## Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

### NOMINATION—SPACE COUNCIL

*Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:* Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Lt. Col. William A. Anders, of California, to be Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautical and Space Council. Prior to this action, in open hearings, the nominee was introduced to the committee by Senator Murphy.

### APPROPRIATIONS—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee continued hearings on fiscal 1970 budget estimates for the District of Columbia, receiving testimony on behalf of funds for their respective D.C. bureaus or agencies from the following witnesses: Dr. William R. Manning, Superintendent of Schools; Paul P. Cooke, president, D.C. Teachers College, and Charles Horsky, Chairman, Board of Higher Education; Dr. Frank Farner, president, Federal City College; Dr. Cleveland L. Dennard, president, Washington Technical Institute; Joseph H. Cole, Director, Recreation Department; Nash Castro, Regional Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Dr. Theodore H. Reed, Director, Na-

tional Zoological Park; and Stephen Gambaro, Assistant Director of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

### APPROPRIATIONS—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee continued hearings on fiscal 1970 budget estimates for independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with testimony in behalf of funds for their respective agencies from Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, and Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, Director, Office of Science and Technology.

Hearings continue tomorrow on funds for the CSC and FCC.

### APPROPRIATIONS—DEFENSE

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee continued executive hearings on fiscal 1970 budget estimates for the Defense Establishment, with testimony on behalf of funds for their Department from Army witnesses.

### EXPORT CONTROL

*Committee on Banking and Currency:* Subcommittee on International Finance, in executive session, approved for full committee consideration an original bill in lieu of S. 1940 and S. 2390 to extend authority to regulate exports under the Export Control Act.

### AIRPORT AND AIRWAYS DEVELOPMENT

*Committee on Commerce:* Aviation Subcommittee continued hearings on pending legislation dealing with the development of airports and airways throughout the United States, having as its witnesses John H. Shaffer, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration; J. Donald Reilly, Airport Operators Council International; John Woods, National Business Aircraft Association; and Marvin Lieske, Airtrom Industries, Inc., Seattle.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

### ATTORNEYS' FEES

*Committee on Commerce:* Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, in executive session, ordered favorably reported to the full committee S. 1653, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with regard to recovery of a reasonable attorney's fee in case of successful maintenance of an action for recovery of damages sustained in transportation of property.

### NOMINATIONS

*Committee on Finance:* Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following nominations:

Donald E. Johnson, of Iowa, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

John R. Petty, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury;



K. Martin Worthy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service); and William H. Harrison, of Wyoming, and William S. Whitehead, of Virginia, to be members of the Renegotiation Board.

Committee will meet again tomorrow to consider H.R. 9951, relating to collection of unemployment taxes.

### CAMPUS DISORDERS

*Committee on Government Operations:* Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations continued hearings on militant organizations and campus riots, with further testimony from John E. Drass, Metropolitan Police Department; Philip R. Manuel, subcommittee staff investigator; Sergeant Stanley White, Oakland, Calif., Police Department; and Jean and Larry Powell, both of whom are former Black Panthers.

Hearings will continue on Tuesday, June 24.

### COMMITTEE BUSINESS

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:* Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following items of business:

The nominations of Carlos C. Camacho, to be Governor of Guam; and Melvin Evans, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands;

S. 1613, to designate the dam commonly referred to as the Glen Canyon Dam as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam;

S. 1076, to establish a 3-year pilot Youth Conservation Corps program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture (amended);

S. 1075, to provide for studies and research in connection with national policy on environmental quality (amended);

S. 38, granting consent of the Congress to the upper Niobrara River compact between Wyoming and Nebraska;

S. 621, to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin;

H.R. 11069, authorizing funds to satisfy judgment in connection with acquisition of lands for Padre Island National Seashore, Texas;

S. 853, to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in Idaho (amended);

S. 912, to establish Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument in Colorado; and

An original resolution (S. Res. 212), requesting an additional \$10,000 for committee expenses.

Also, committee agreed to a proposed modification of the Alaska "land freeze" order (P.L.O. 4582), to permit the State of Alaska to select a 7.4-acre tract of land on Cold Bay for a fisheries management administrative site.

### COMMITTEE BUSINESS

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following items of business:

S. 980, to provide U.S. Federal courts with jurisdiction over contract claims against nonappropriated fund activities of the United States;

H. Con. Res. 114, providing for commemoration of the 200th anniversary of Dartmouth College;

S. 952, authorizing appointment of additional district court judges in various States (amended);

S. Con. Res. 17, to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway;

S.J. Res. 88, to create a commission to study and recommend changes in the bankruptcy laws;

H.R. 4297, extending for 1 year the date for final report of National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws, and authorize additional funds therefor;

H.R. 4600, liberalizing the corporate charter of the National Education Association of the United States;

S. 2173, relating to prescribing penalties for acts of violence or intimidation in the case of Indian tribes;

Sixteen private immigration bills: An original Senate concurrent resolution, suspension of deportation under section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (23 cases), S. 152, S. 690, S. 1087, S. 1128, S. 1677, S. 1704, H.R. 1437, H.R. 1632, H.R. 1939, H.R. 1960, H.R. 2005, H.R. 2336, H.R. 5136, H.R. 6607; and

Two private claims bills (S. 632 and S. 1932).

The nominations of—

Lincoln C. Almond, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Rhode Island;

Doroteo R. Baca, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Mexico;

John L. Bowers, Jr., to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee;

Royal K. Buttars, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Utah;

David J. Cannon, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin;

Anthony J. P. Farris, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas;

Christian Hansen, Jr., to be U.S. marshal for the district of Vermont;

J. Pat Madrid, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Arizona;

John C. Meiszner, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Illinois;

Edward J. Michaels, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Delaware;

Otis L. Packwood, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Montana;









7. POLLUTION. A subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 12085, to amend the Clean Air Act to extend the program of research relating to fuel and vehicles. p. D546  
Rep. Cleveland inserted an editorial, "Thermal Pollution: An Overheated Issue." pp. H5192-3
8. HOT DOGS. Rep. Landrum stated that while he agreed that chicken should be included on the ingredient label of hot dogs it would be confusing to require that the product label or name indicate the presence of chicken. p. H5079
9. TOBACCO. Rep. Carter supported the cigarette labeling and advertising bill as reported by the committee which would preempt the advertising ban proposed by the FCC. p. H5195
10. TAXATION. Rep. Podell stated that the "need for tax reform...is so obvious as to be blatant." pp. H5191-2  
Rep. Fascell stated that the "national economy requires retention of the surtax for a reasonable time and the American taxpayer requires more equal treatment from our tax laws." pp. H5157-8
11. CENSUS. Rep. Quillen advocated the number of mandatory questions contained in the census questionnaire be cut down to name, address, age, sex, head of household, race or color, and persons in home at time of census. pp. H5156-7
12. SHOE IMPORTS. Rep. Burke, Mass., expressed concern that small shoe factories are finding competition with foreign imports too much and are going out of business. pp. H5079-80
13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that consideration of the surcharge extension bill "will be put over until a later date." pp. H5155-6

SENATE

14. FOOD STAMPS. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 126, to increase from \$340 million to \$750 million the appropriation authorization to operate the food stamp program (pp. S6975, S6977-92, S6995-8). Sen. Ellender said, "Under the program that we hope to adopt early next month, the funds that will be appropriated in accordance with this joint resolution will be spent in accord with a revised food stamp program. In the joint resolution we are not attempting to change the present Food Stamp Act in any manner except to increase the amount of the authorization" (p. S6977).
15. CLAIMS. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments S. 980, to provide U. S. courts with jurisdiction over contract claims against nonappropriated fund activities of the U. S. (S. Rept. 91-268). p. S7038
16. GREAT PLAINS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 1790, to continue the Great Plains conservation program (S. Rept. 91-269). p. S7038
17. YOUTH CORPS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee with amendments S. 1076, to establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps (S. Rept. 91-270). p. S7038

18. RIVER COMPACT. Passed without amendment S. 38, to provide congressional consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between Wyo. and Neb. The upper Niobrara River compact provides a division or apportionment between the States of the available surface water supply of the Upper Niobrara River Basin and to provide for studies of the subsurface water supplies of the basin. pp. S6993-4
19. NASA. The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee marked up and voted to report (but did not actually report) in the nature of a substitute bill, H. R. 11271, the 1970 NASA authorization bill. p. D543
20. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 11582, the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies appropriation bill, 1970. p. D543
21. TAXATION. Sen. Metcalf opposed taking action to extend the surtax without having a tax reform package to consider right along with it. p. S6995
22. INFLATION. Received from National City, Calif., City council a resolution praying for the enactment of legislation to halt current inflationary trends in the U. S. pp. S7037-8
23. FARM TRAINING. Sen. Yarborough submitted an amendment (for himself and Sen. Cranston jointly) to S. 338, to provide allowance increases to veterans engaged in on-the-job training, farm training, and vocational rehabilitation. The increases would be comparable to those provided in the bill for veterans taking high school and college courses under the GI bill. p. S7049
24. MEXICAN-AMERICANS. Sen. Goldwater praised and expressed his affection for Mexican-American citizens. p. S7053
25. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Sen. Jackson inserted some articles which he recommended as a realistic and up-to-date interpretation of the "Soviet adversary." pp. S7055-62  
Sen. Nelson spoke of his concern over the Nigerian-Biafran controversy and inserted a report by a member of his staff on the subject. pp. S7068-70
26. HUNGER. Sen. McGovern commended the President's selection of Dr. Jean Mayer as Director of the October White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health. pp. S7064-5  
Sen. McGovern inserted a "position paper" on hunger which he said demonstrates the inadequacies of the present food stamp program. pp. S7076-8
27. PESTICIDES. Sen. Nelson expressed concern over the use of pesticides chemicals and inserted supporting articles. pp. S7072-5



## YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

---

JUNE 24, 1969.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany S. 1076]

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following language:

## POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth during the summer months in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

## YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States

under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary. The Corps shall be open to youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications: *Provided, however*, That preference shall be given to disadvantaged youth. Employment preference for temporary supervisory personnel shall be given to primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators, and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resources disciplines.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine the areas under their administrative jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out programs using employees of the Corps. The rates and hours and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall be as jointly determined by the two Secretaries: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (28 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.), and the Act of September 6, 1966 (5 U.S.C. § 8102 et seq.). The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of Corps members. No member of the Corps may be employed for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the Corps in their duties. To minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall, insofar as is feasible, be employed on conservation projects nearest to their place of residence.

(d) Wherever feasible and appropriate, vacated Civilian Conservation Centers and other unoccupied facilities maintained and operated by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture shall be utilized for the purposes of this program. Unoccupied military facilities shall also be utilized where appropriate and necessary, and upon approval by the Secretary of Defense.

(e) The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to other temporary program support staff.

SEC. 3 (a) Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall further transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

(b) The Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture shall prepare a joint report, indicating the feasibility of initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource conservation or outdoor recreation agencies. This report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act. The President shall further transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

SEC. 4. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read :

A bill to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

#### PURPOSE OF THE MEASURE

The purpose of this legislation, which was introduced by Senator Jackson for himself and 26 cosponsors, is to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program for young men and women, 14-18 years of age, who would participate in summer work and educational projects in our national parks, forests, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, and other public lands administered by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture for periods up to 90 days. Corps members would be employed by the Department of Interior or Agriculture,



without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary. This program is seen as a step toward developing a valuable public resource—our lands—while at the same time benefiting our greatest national asset—our youth.

In addition to providing work experience, the program is envisioned as an opportunity to benefit the young enrollees by—

(1) Enhancing their understanding of the natural environment and its relationship to them;

(2) Stimulating high school youth who are capable of attaining greater goals, but presently lack motivation or direction in school, and

(3) Providing a forum for discussion and mutual understanding between youth of all socioeconomic and racial origins.

The bill authorizes appropriations to support a 3-year pilot program for approximately 3000 youth each year. If the pilot program is successful, it can be continued and expanded into a permanent program.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amended the bill by deleting all after the enacting clause, and substituting language to adopt, in substance, suggestions made by the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, as well as the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Bureau of the Budget.

The effect of the committee amendments are as follows:

1. The title of the bill was changed to reflect the fact that the Youth Conservation Corps is initially to be operated as a pilot program.

2. Specific language was added stating that membership in the Corps shall be open to youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications; however, a preference is to be extended to disadvantaged youngsters.

3. A second preference clause was added to indicate that the preferred source of temporary staff personnel is to be primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators, and university students in the field of education and natural resources.

4. A provision was included which charges the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture with the responsibility of promulgating regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of Corps members.

5. Language was added to provide that, insofar as is feasible, Corps members will be employed on conservation projects nearest their place of residence.

6. Language was added to authorize the use of existing Federal facilities, wherever feasible, for operation of the program.

7. A provision was added to exclude temporary supervisory personnel and program support staff from consideration under the provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968.

8. A new section 3 was added directing the preparation of an annual program review report to the President and the Congress by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture.

9. Section 3 further directs the preparation of a report by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, indicating the feasibility of initiating

ing a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource conservation or other outdoor recreation agencies.

10. A new section 4 was added which authorizes appropriations for the pilot Youth Conservation Corps for a 3-year period, with the appropriation level not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually.

#### BACKGROUND

Several bills have been introduced in Congress during the past 10 years to establish youth conservation programs, although they differed in either scope or objective from S. 1076. This also applies to the civilian conservation centers operated under the Job Corps program which offer full-time employment for disadvantaged, out-of-school youth.

Section 101 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended by Public Law 90-222, authorizes the creation of the Job Corps in which unemployed, out-of-school, 14- to 22-year-old men and women could enroll for up to 2 years. According to section 106 of this act, no less than 40 percent of the male Job Corps enrollees were to be engaged in natural resource management work at civilian conservation centers. As of March 31, 1969, the capacity for civilian conservation center enrollees totaled 14,371. This number is to be reduced to 5,896, effective June 30, 1969.

Section 120 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, authorizes the creation of a work-training program: the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Enrollees of this program conduct such duties as beautification projects and improvements and maintenance of school buildings, parks, and recreation facilities. Of the 364,000 youth enrolled in the 1968 summer Neighborhood Youth Corps program, approximately 600 conducted conservation work in connection with the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

#### NEED

S. 1076 is designed to provide summer employment opportunities for youth, primarily those from urban areas, who have varying economic, social and racial backgrounds. Far too many young Americans never have an opportunity to receive meaningful work experiences. Because of the summer employment problems in urban areas, young men and women often turn from walking the streets seeking jobs to roaming the streets in pursuit of mischief.

More than a year ago, the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders reported that the lack of substantial employment opportunities for the youth trapped in urban ghettos was one of the principal causes of riots. The youth of these areas were characterized as encountering a life of despair and hopelessness. The Commission recommended greatly expanded training and employment opportunities for ghetto youth as the primary component of an attack on the causes of urban poverty. The Youth Conservation Corps would reach many of these young men and women and demonstrate to them that they can play a significant role in the functioning of our society.

At a time when there is great national concern for the maintenance of the natural environment and for meeting the burgeoning demands for outdoor recreation, measures need to be taken to intensify resource



management programs. If the future leaders of our Nation are to be expected to understand that the great out-of-doors has a relevant role in their lives, they must experience the sense of accomplishment in completing a difficult task, of understanding the intricacies of land and water conservation and management, and of working in programs to assure that future generations of Americans will enjoy life in a quality environment.

These young men and women would be employed in a variety of conservation duties. They would help to reduce the tremendous backlog of maintenance and development work necessary in our park and recreation lands. The Corps members would be expected to perform a variety of projects including timber stand improvement, trail maintenance, wildlife habitat improvement, basic soil and water conservation duties, and maintenance and construction of campgrounds and picnic facilities.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 declares the policy and purpose of the act. The purpose of the act is to further the development and maintenance of the Nation's natural resources by those individuals upon whom will ultimately fall the responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources.

Section 2(a) authorizes the establishment of a 3-year pilot Youth Conservation Corps program for young men and women between the ages of 14 and 18 who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories or possessions. Corps members would be hired without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purposes of assisting the respective departments in developing, preserving, and maintaining lands and waters of the United States under their jurisdiction.

This subsection also declares that Corps membership would not be restricted to the disadvantaged youth, but that preference in the selection of members would be extended to such youth. The committee, in executive session, felt that the word "disadvantaged" should be interpreted to include youth who were socially and economically deprived. This would include individuals from all racial, social, and economic backgrounds who, due to living in an environment characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or for a multitude of other disorienting conditions, have not received those amenities of life accruing to the majority of American youth.

The committee intends that in the selection of disadvantaged youth, care should be taken to select those who would benefit most by the opportunity to participate in the program. This determination could best be made by student counselors, teachers, and administrators who have a close working relationship with prospective Corps members. A cooperative agreement between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and the school systems regarding recruiting procedures would assist the program in fulfilling its stated objectives with youth from widely varying socioeconomic backgrounds.

Section 2(a) also empowers the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to extend an employment preference for temporary supervisory personnel to primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators, and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resources disciplines.

For the Corps to be fully successful, a staff of technically trained supervisory personnel is necessary. Teachers, professors, and students, particularly those trained in the natural resource disciplines, would be available during the summer months and could fill this need.

Section 2(b) sets forth provisions for setting rates and hours and other conditions of employment for Corps members by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. Corps members are not to be deemed as Federal employees other than for the purposes of the Torts Claims Procedures Act of June 25, 1948, as amended, and the act of September 6, 1966, pertaining to compensation for disability and death.

Provisions are also included which authorize the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of Corps members.

Section 2(c) provides that certain costs such as transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other necessary and appropriate services and equipment be provided by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. To minimize transportation costs, the Secretaries are also to enroll Corps members on conservation projects nearest their place of residence, wherever possible.

Section 2(d) authorizes the use of unoccupied Federal facilities, wherever feasible and appropriate, for operation of the program. Specific reference was made to vacated civilian conservation centers formerly operated under the Job Corps, and unoccupied facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense. The use of Department of Defense facilities is contingent upon the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

As a result of the recent reduction in the number of civilian conservation centers which are operated by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture under the Job Corps program, there are 50 such centers which will be vacated in the near future. Another eight centers, located in the States of Oregon, Arizona, South Dakota, New Mexico, Minnesota, New Jersey, California, and New York, which were closed because of previous program cutbacks, are presently vacant. All 58 centers are permanent facilities and would require a minimum of maintenance costs to prepare for use under this program.

Section 2(e) excludes Corps members, temporary supervising personnel, and other temporary program support staff from consideration under provisions of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

Section 3(a) calls for an annual report to be submitted to the President, and subsequently to the Congress, on the contribution of the program toward achieving its stated objectives. This report is intended to specify the accomplishments of each summer's program and provide recommendations for improving the operation and productivity of the Corps program.

The intention of the annual report is to provide the Congress through its appropriate committees an opportunity to exercise their legislative oversight responsibilities and to determine whether to continue and expand the Corps beyond the entitled 3-year pilot program.

Section 3(b) directs the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to prepare a report indicating the feasibility and practicability of initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource conservation or outdoor recreation agencies. This report would be submitted in an identical manner to that provided for in section 3(a),



except that the required date of submission is within 1 year from enactment of the act.

The report, which would provide a summary of all youth conservation programs under State government auspices, together with their accomplishments, would serve as a guide to determine whether implementation of a cost-sharing program would be beneficial in achieving the overall purposes of the Youth Conservation Corps. The report is also intended to include recommendations on a cost-sharing formula, and to insure a smooth jurisdictional transfer of responsibility to the State, in the event that the report is favorable.

Section 4 authorizes appropriations for a 3-year pilot program. The pilot program is authorized to minimize the program costs and to provide data for an annual program analysis report to determine if the Corps is fulfilling the intended objectives of the act. The appropriation authorization is for a 3-year period only. Before the life of the program can be extended, or its size increased beyond the third year of the program, the program would be reviewed and new legislation would be required.

The annual authorized appropriations are not to exceed \$3,500,000 to be made available to the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recommends that S. 1708, as amended, be enacted.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The executive communications from the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Labor, and the Office of Economic Opportunity and Bureau of the Budget, are set forth in full as follows:

#### U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
*Washington, D.C., April 18, 1969.*

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,

*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your committee has requested a report from this Department on S. 1076, a bill to establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, a Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

The bill provides that the Youth Conservation Corps would be composed of young men and women 14 through 18 years of age. They would be employed for periods not to exceed 90 days in any one year by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. Their employment would be without regard to civil service classification laws or regulations. Members of the Corps would be considered Federal employees only for purposes of the Tort Claims Act, and laws relating to compensation for injuries. Rates, hours, and other conditions of employment would be jointly determined by the two Secretaries, and each would be authorized to make appropriate provisions for transportation, lodging, and subsistence.

If the bill were enacted, experienced personnel would be needed to work with young people between the ages of 14 and 18 and to provide them with the necessary supervision. Additional staff with these capabilities would be required if the Department were to successfully operate the youth conservation program. Because of present budgetary and personnel limitations, it would be extremely difficult to recruit such qualified people partially because of the temporary nature of their employment. Thus, while we support the objectives of the bill, our present departmental priorities dictate that any additional personnel made available must be used in other critical areas.

The Department also believes that the short-term nature of the proposed projects, the fact that youths could not remain over 90 days, would mean constant change and substantially limit the learning experience. The participants would have to be assigned to the simplest types of activities which would not require continuity. The opportunity to develop a useful environmental orientation would be limited. This Department is concerned that the type of environmental exposure envisioned by the youth conservation program would not be realized under the present bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,  
*Under Secretary of the Interior.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
*Washington, April 21, 1969.*

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
U.S. Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you asked, here is our report on S. 1076, a bill to establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

The purpose of S. 1076 would be to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth upon whom will fall the responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources. It would declare a congressional finding that gainful employment of youth in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park, national forest, and national wildlife refuge systems, and other public lands administered by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage.

The bill would establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps. The Corps would consist of young men and women who have attained age 14 but have not attained age 19. The Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture would employ such youths for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under their jurisdiction. Members of the Corps would be employed without regard to civil service or classi-



fication authorities, and would be appointed without regard to geographical location or economic status.

The rates, hours, and areas of work and other conditions of employment in the Corps would be determined by the two Secretaries. Members of the Corps would generally not be deemed to be Federal employees. No member of the Corps could be employed for a term exceeding 90 consecutive days in any one calendar year.

The Secretaries would be authorized to provide transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment for the needs of members of the Corps. The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) would not apply to appointments made to the Corps.

We recommend that S. 1076 not be enacted. As presently structured, the bill could be interpreted to duplicate or overlap a number of youth programs presently authorized and operating.

Further, there are not sufficient funds available to devote to such a program at this time. We, therefore, believe the present mix of programs can better meet the objectives for our Nation's youth. The conservation work which would be accomplished by a youth conservation work program should be done. However, there are more effective ways to do this work with the funds that are available for this purpose.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL, *Under Secretary.*

---

TESTIMONY OF J. N. PEET, MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, U.S. SENATE, ON S. 1076

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, effective conservation programs in the Nation's parks and forests and efforts to instill the Nation's young people with an appreciation of their natural heritage are highly laudable objectives. Therefore, I regret that I cannot appear before you today in support of the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. The proposed legislation does not provide a sound basis for furnishing trained manpower to carry out useful conservation activities. In my estimation, it does not offer an efficient and practical way for developing the occupational skills of young men and women. And it overlooks the various employment and work experience programs for young people that are already in existence and which have conservation components in many instances.

I shall discuss our reasons for opposing this bill under five principal headings.

*1. Limited usefulness of experience*

First, the usefulness of experience contemplated by this bill would be severely limited because of (a) the extremely short period of time during which any person would be permitted to be enrolled and (b) the inexperience of the youth involved. Employment under this bill would be restricted to 90 days in any calendar year. The periods of time which would be required in orientation, instruction regarding the

operation of tools and equipment, physical conditioning, and the rudiments of first aid and woodcraft would leave little, if any, time for productive work at remote locations. In general, the young people enrolled in the program could only be given light work involving simple handtools or cleanup activities suitable for inexperienced labor.

Thus, it would not be possible for these youth to undertake in the short space of 90 days much of the work contemplated by this bill. It was indicated that projects would include the "maintenance and construction of campgrounds, bridges, trails, water control structures, picnic facilities, plus assistance in forest reseedling, timber stand improvement, and other basic forest, soil and conservation, and wildlife habitat measures." These seem beyond accomplishment by youth who lack a substantial background in mechanical and conservation skills.

## *2. High cost*

Second, the residential character of this program would raise costs significantly. Based on costs encountered in similar programs, it is estimated that the program proposed by this bill would cost at least \$1,000 per enrollee. Costs might well range higher, particularly if extensive transportation were involved. This compares with costs of about \$400 per enrollee incurred last summer and **expected next summer** in the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

## *3. Alternative summer youth opportunities*

Third, the Federal Government has a host of summer work programs which will reach over 600,000 youth this summer. Some of the specific projects already involve conservation activities.

This summer it is expected that the Neighborhood Youth Corps will provide employment experience to more than 350,000 youth. A number of these projects are in the conservation area, involving maintenance, beautification, painting, tree trimming, and planting. Much useful conservation work which can safely be performed by youth is available near their homes and does not involve the heavy cost of transporting and maintaining them at remote locations in the national parks and forests. In addition, it should be noted that these NYC programs encompass counseling, orientation, and frequently remedial education as well as work experience.

Examples of these projects include:

Project "Weld," New York State Department of Labor at Albany, employing 335 enrollees in conservation work.

United Planning Organization, Washington, D.C., employs approximately 230 enrollees in conservation work.

Economic Opportunity Council, Inc., Malone, N.Y., employs approximately 200 enrollees in conservation work.

Illinois Farmers Union, Springfield, Ill., employs 200 enrollees in conservation in 72 Illinois counties.

Rockingham County Community Action Council, Portsmouth, N.H., employs 75 enrollees in conservation work.

Community Renewal Team of Greater Hartford, Hartford, Conn., employs approximately 60 enrollees in conservation work.

West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, Charleston, W. Va., employs 400 enrollees in conservation work.



Cheyenne River Indian Tribe, Eagle Butte, S. Dak.—180 enrollees engaged in conservation work.

City of Butte, Mont.—150 enrollees engaged in conservation work.

South Colorado Community Action Agency, Durango, Colo.—134 enrollees engaged in conservation work.

Kentucky Division of Forestry, Frankfort, Ky.—165 enrollees engaged in conservation work.

Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing, Mich.—75 enrollees engaged in conservation work throughout the State.

Lower Chattahoochee Community Action Agency, Columbus, Ga., employs 200 enrollees in conservation work.

In addition to the summer employment positions in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Federal Government itself expects to hire approximately 70,000 disadvantaged youth. Jobs available this summer under the JOBS program operated in conjunction with the National Alliance of Businessmen are expected to total 175,000—all for disadvantaged youth.

Aside from employment programs, it is expected that over 5,600 youth will be trained in defense installations under Project Value. Both the Department of Labor and the Civil Service Commission are cooperating in the operation of this program.

In addition, the Office of Economic Opportunity is funneling approximately \$35 million for summer youth programs through community action agencies.

#### *4. No priority for disadvantaged youth*

Fourth, the bill fails to define any target group and, further, does not afford a priority to disadvantaged youth.

Present manpower programs, including those directed toward youth during summer months, contain a built-in preference for persons who are disadvantaged. This preference is necessary and desirable in order to target public resources on those youth most in need of work experience and income. Maintenance of this preference is highly desirable and a crucial factor in the design of summer youth programs as they have been developed by the Vice President in this and the previous administration. However, this bill does not provide for such a priority and actually prevents its application by prohibiting a person's "economic status" from being used as a factor in his selection.

#### *5. Safety and supervision*

Finally, the bill raises serious questions of safety and supervision for enrollees.

Some of the work described would require the use of power tools and equipment at remote locations. Much of it would, of necessity, involve work which an employer in interstate commerce would be prohibited from assigning these youth under the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The intense instruction and extremely close supervision required to adequately protect these youth from serious injury might well completely offset the anticipated reductions in the workload of regular National Park and Forest Service personnel. This bill contains no provisions dealing with safety and supervision.

### *Conclusion*

Let me conclude by saying that the administration recognizes a need to expand programs of training, recreation, and guidance to stimulate personal growth of the youth in the Nation. It also recognizes the need to take appropriate steps to preserve and conserve the Nation's parks and forests. The Department of Labor, in conjunction with the Office of Economic Opportunity, is currently exploring methods by which those Job Corps conservation camps scheduled for closing may be put to use by the States and other agencies with an interest in conservation. However, the administration opposes this bill because it does not promise to achieve effectively the goals of the personal development of youth and conservation.

I ask the committee to accept this statement in lieu of the written report on this bill requested by the committee. The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this statement from the standpoint of the administration's program.

---

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
*Washington, D.C., April 21, 1969.*

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for requesting our comments on S. 1076, to establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

Our evaluation of this measure from the standpoint of its relevance to the antipoverty effort indicates that its contribution to that effort would not be very significant. To some extent the activities envisioned in this proposal duplicate those of enrollees in Job Corps conservation centers. However, under the provisions of S. 1076 enrollment in the proposed Youth Conservation Corps would not, as in the case of the Job Corps, be limited to disadvantaged youth but would be open to young men and women without regard to their socioeconomic status. We do not think it is likely that under such enrollment standards many youths from poverty backgrounds would be selected for participation in this program. These young men and women who have suffered the often damaging effects of a deprived childhood are more likely than youth from more affluent backgrounds to present disciplinary and other problems, and this factor would probably discourage their selection.

While we are sympathetic to the general thrust of this proposal, we think that a rational ordering of our national priorities would dictate that such programs be assigned a relatively low priority status. Accordingly, it is our recommendation at this time that S. 1076 not be given favorable consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report to Congress from the standpoint of the President's program.

Sincerely,

BERTRAND M. HARDING,  
*Acting Director.*



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
*Washington, D.C., April 21, 1969.*

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for our comments on S. 1076, a bill to establish in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

The bill provides for a Youth Conservation Corps consisting of young men and women between 14 and 19 years of age. Members of the Corps would be employed by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture for periods not to exceed 90 consecutive days in any one year in order to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States and to create an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's national environment and heritage. They would work on public land and water areas under the jurisdiction of the two Departments. Their employment would be without regard to civil service classification laws or regulations. Rates, hours, and other conditions of employment would be jointly determined by the two Secretaries, and each would be authorized to make appropriate provisions for transportation, lodging, and subsistence.

The Bureau of the Budget generally concurs in the comments of the Departments of Labor, Interior, and Agriculture, and the Office of Economic Opportunity on this bill.

While the Youth Conservation Corps is intended to promote conservation objectives, the short time period of employment in the Corps would make it of doubtful value in promoting conservation work of more significance than the simplest types of activities. It would also limit the usefulness of the Corps in terms of providing training and work experience of lasting value. Moreover, the Federal Government is already specifically involving young people in conservation and related activities, for short and longer term periods, through the Neighborhood Youth Corps community action agencies, and Job Corps conservation centers.

In view of the many demands on the always limited availability of Federal budget funds, we do not believe this program represents a high priority use of scarce budget dollars. For one thing, the provisions in the bill for lodging and subsistence could result in a significant expense per enrollee, estimated by the Department of Labor as at least \$1,000 for the 90 days of employment, excluding transportation. As the Department points out in its testimony, this compares with \$400 per enrollee in the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program. In addition, this program is not directed to disadvantaged youth, who are most in need of manpower services and jobs.

For these and the other reasons cited by the various executive branch agencies asked to comment, the Bureau of the Budget recommends against enactment of S. 1076.

Sincerely yours,

WILFRED H. ROMMEL,  
*Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.*





91ST CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 1076

[Report No. 91-270]

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 18, 1969

Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

JUNE 24, 1969

Reported by Mr. JACKSON, with amendments

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

---

## A BILL

To establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture  
Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3                               POLICY AND PURPOSE

4       SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employ-  
5       ment of American youth in the healthful outdoor atmosphere  
6       afforded in the national park system, the national forest sys-  
7       tem, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public  
8       land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the

1 Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an oppor-  
2 tunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's  
3 natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the  
4 purpose of this Act to further the development and main-  
5 tenance of the natural resources of the United States by the  
6 youth upon whom will fall the responsibility for maintaining  
7 and managing these resources.

8 YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

9 SEC. 2. (a) To carry out authorized programs with re-  
10 spect to the lands and waters referred to in section 1 of this  
11 Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the  
12 Interior and the Department of Agriculture a Youth Con-  
13 servation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps").  
14 The Corps shall consist of young men and women who  
15 are permanent residents of the United States, its territories,  
16 or possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not  
17 attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the In-  
18 terior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ without  
19 regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or  
20 regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or  
21 maintaining lands and waters of the United States under  
22 the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary. Members of the  
23 Corps shall be appointed without regard to geographical  
24 locations or economic status.



1        ~~(b)~~ The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of  
2    Agriculture shall determine the areas under their administra-  
3    tive jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out pro-  
4    grams using employees of the Corps. The rates and hours  
5    and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall be as  
6    jointly determined by the two Secretaries: *Provided*, That  
7    members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal  
8    employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June 25,  
9    1948, as amended ~~(28 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.)~~, and the Act  
10   of September 6, 1966 ~~(5 U.S.C. 8102 et seq.)~~: *And pro-*  
11 *vided further*, That no member of the Corps may be em-  
12 ployed for a term in excess of ninety consecutive days during  
13 any one calendar year.

14        ~~(c)~~ The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of  
15    Agriculture may provide for such transportation, lodging,  
16    subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may  
17    deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of  
18    the Corps in their duties.

19        ~~(d)~~ The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Ex-  
20    penditure Control Act of 1968 ~~(82 Stat. 251, 270)~~ shall not  
21    apply to appointments made to the Corps.

22        ~~(e)~~ There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to  
23    each Department such sums as are necessary to carry out  
24    the purposes of this Act.

## POLICY AND PURPOSE

1  
2       *SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employ-*  
3 *ment of American youth during the summer months in the*  
4 *healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park*  
5 *system, the national forest system, the national wildlife ref-*  
6 *uge system, and other public land and water areas ad-*  
7 *ministered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary*  
8 *of Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and*  
9 *appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and herit-*  
10 *age. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the*  
11 *development and maintenance of the natural resources of the*  
12 *United States by the youth upon whom will fall the ultimate*  
13 *responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources*  
14 *for the American people.*

## YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

15  
16       *SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there*  
17 *is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the*  
18 *Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program des-*  
19 *ignated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter re-*  
20 *ferred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young*  
21 *men and women who are permanent residents of the United*  
22 *States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age*  
23 *fourteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the*  
24 *Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture*  
25 *may employ without regard to the civil service or classifica-*



1    *tion laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of develop-*  
2    *ing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the*  
3    *United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate*  
4    *Secretary. The Corps shall be open to youth of all social,*  
5    *economic, and racial classifications: Provided, however, That*  
6    *preference shall be given to disadvantaged youth. Employ-*  
7    *ment preference for temporary supervisory personnel shall*  
8    *be given to primary, secondary, and university teachers and*  
9    *administrators, and university students pursuing studies in*  
10    *the education and natural resources disciplines.*

11        *(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of*  
12    *Agriculture shall determine the areas under their administra-*  
13    *tive jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out pro-*  
14    *grams using employees of the Corps. The rates and hours*  
15    *and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall be as*  
16    *jointly determined by the two Secretaries: Provided, That*  
17    *members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal*  
18    *employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June 25,*  
19    *1948, as amended (28 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.), and the Act*  
20    *of September 6, 1966 (5 U.S.C. 8102 et seq.). The Secre-*  
21    *tary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall*  
22    *promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and wel-*  
23    *fare of Corps members. No member of the Corps may be*  
24    *employed for a term in excess of ninety days during any sin-*  
25    *gle year.*

1       (c) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of  
2   Agriculture may provide for such transportation, lodging,  
3   subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may  
4   deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of  
5   the Corps in their duties. To minimize transportation costs,  
6   Corps members shall, insofar as is feasible, be employed on  
7   conservation projects nearest to their place of residence.

8       (d) Wherever feasible and appropriate, vacated Civil-  
9   ian Conservation Centers and other unoccupied facilities  
10   maintained and operated by the Departments of the Interior  
11   and Agriculture shall be utilized for the purposes of this pro-  
12   gram. Unoccupied military facilities shall also be utilized  
13   where appropriate and necessary, and upon approval by the  
14   Secretary of Defense.

15       (e) The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Ex-  
16   penditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not  
17   apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary  
18   supervisory personnel, or to other temporary program sup-  
19   port staff.

20       SEC. 3. (a) Upon completion of each year's pilot  
21   program, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture  
22   shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the  
23   program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and pro-  
24   viding recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to  
25   the President not later than one hundred and eighty days fol-



1    *lowing completion of that year's pilot program. The Presi-*  
2    *dent shall further transmit the report to the Congress for*  
3    *review and appropriate action.*

4        *(b) The Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture shall*  
5    *prepare a joint report, indicating the feasibility of initiating a*  
6    *cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural*  
7    *resource conservation or outdoor recreation agencies. This*  
8    *report shall be submitted to the President not later than one*  
9    *year following enactment of this Act. The President shall*  
10   *further transmit the report to the Congress for review and*  
11   *appropriate action.*

12        *SEC. 4. For three years following enactment of this*  
13   *Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to*  
14   *exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to the*  
15   *Departments of the Interior and Agriculture to carry out*  
16   *the purposes of this Act.*

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes."

91<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

**S. 1076**

[Report No. 91-270]

---

**A BILL**

---

To establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MERCAILE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERCY, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio

---

FEBRUARY 18, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

JUNE 24, 1969

Reported with amendments









June 26, 69

SENATE

11. CONSERVATION. Passed as reported S. 1790, the Great Plains conservation bill. Sen. Mansfield quoted from the committee report: "This bill would extend the Great Plains conservation program for 10 years and enlarge its scope in a number of minor respects. The program is one under which the Secretary enters into conservation cost sharing contracts of up to 10 years with producers in counties susceptible to wind erosion in the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming." pp. S7199-202

Passed as reported S. 1076, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. Sen. Mansfield quoted from the committee report: "The purpose of this legislation...is to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program for young men and women, 14--18 years of age, who would participate in summer work and educational projects in our national parks, forests, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, and other public lands administered by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture for periods up to 90 days...The bill authorizes appropriations to support a 3-year pilot program for approximately 3000 youth each year." pp. S7202-4

12. TAXATION. The Finance Committee reported with amendment H. R. 9951, relative to the collection of Federal unemployment tax (S. Rept. 91-281). p. S7214

Sen. Metcalf expressed his willingness for the present income tax withholding rates to be continued for 90 days so that any proposal to extend the surcharge can be considered simultaneously with comprehensive tax reform. p. S7225

13. RESEARCH. The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11271, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management (S. Rept. 91-282)(p. S7214). Includes in the Space Applications program for cooperation with this Department in determining the spectrum of remote sensor requirements necessary to apply space technology to the fields of agriculture, forestry, oceanography, meteorology, etc.

Passed with amendment H. R. 12167, fiscal 1970 authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission. Includes funds for isotopes development program involving use of radioisotopes for combating environmental pollution and for the preservation of food by radiation. S. 2416, a similar bill, was postponed indefinitely. pp. S7265-71

14. EXPORT CONTROL. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 122, to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949. p. S7204

15. RECREATION. Passed as reported S. 621, to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, Wisc. pp. S7212-14

Passed with amendments S. 1708, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 by authorizing the sale of surplus Federal properties at less than the full 50 percent of fair market value which is required under present law. pp. S7271-2, S7280-2

16. APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Williams, Del., submitted and discussed two amendments he intends to propose to the USDA appropriation bill. He stated that one amendment would place a limit of \$20,000 on farm payments and the other would repeal the "snap-back" provision. He inserted a list of the 1968 total payments of \$60,000 and over under ASCS programs (excluding price support loans). pp. S7224-5, S7275-80  
H. R. 11582, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill was made the unfinished business. p. S7282
17. APPALACHIA. The "Daily Digest" states that the Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1072, the "proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1969. As approved by the committee the bill would provide: (1) \$294 million for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for Appalachian regional development, including extension of Appalachian development, including extension of Appalachian highway system (2) \$285 million for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for extension of authority of the five regional commissions, not more than \$100 million of which could be used for regional development transportation system, and (3) 1-year extension of title 1 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act providing public works grants through the Economic Development Administration." p. D559
18. WATER POLLUTION. The "Daily Digest" states a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee approved for full committee consideration with amendments S. 7, proposed Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969. p. D559
19. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Montoya stated the effect of the raise in interest rates "will spread far and wide--to the ruin of homebuilders, homeowners, small businessmen, farmers, and others." pp. S7227-9
20. WATER. Sen. Murphy inserted an article by former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl Coke in support of legislation to modernize the "archaic 160-acre limitation provision of our reclamation regulations." p. S7235
21. TIMBER; FORESTRY. Sen. Montoya stated that it is the Forest Service which is "largely responsible for the conditions which are depriving producers of raw material they can operate profitably." He announced hearings in order to seek "an accounting from the Secretary of Agriculture for the conduct of the Forest Service." p. S7237
22. POVERTY. Sen. Goodell inserted a review of Dr. Levitan's book, "The Great Society's Poor Law: A New Approach to Poverty." pp. S7254-55
23. GRAINS. Sen. Hruska spoke in support of proposed legislation to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to insure loans made to farmers for the construction or purchase of facilities for storage of grain on the farm. p. S7255  
Sen. Hartke criticized the International Grains Arrangement and stated that the "high prices established by the new convention have encouraged uneconomical production of wheat abroad." pp. S7257-61
24. EDUCATION. Sen. Murphy inserted his testimony in favor of Federal aid to education in impacted areas. pp. S7261-5



Plains area as a supplier of our Nation's foodstuffs can only be fully realized by putting into effect those practices and procedures which will more completely control the effects of weather hazards. Drought, destructive winds, floods, and other natural disasters cannot be prevented, but their damaging effects can be minimized. The Great Plains conservation program is an integral key to this need.

The region is subject to severe climatic variations that periodically bring wide suffering and serious economic losses. Because of the character of some soils in the region, and the normal low rainfall pattern, continuous cultivation of the entire area creates serious problems of wind erosion and resultant economic distress occur and recur.

In the 10-State area covered by the program there are approximately 110,500,000 acres of cropland and 215 million acres of range and pastureland. About 43 million acres of cropland and 91 million acres of range and pastureland now have treatment adequate to meet the conservation needs of the land. Thus, more than half the cropland,

range, and pastureland still need conservation treatment. These acreages include about 5,500,000 acres of cropland that are not suited for sustained cropland production and should be converted to permanent vegetation, and about 12,500,000 acres of range and pastureland that need reestablishment of vegetative cover.

Conservation treatment of cropland, range, and pastures produces substantial community and national benefits. Proper land use and treatment materially reduce the sediment polluting our Nation's streams and reduces soil dust in the air. Dust contamination of the air causes, among other things, serious respiratory ailments.

The fact that contracts covering less than one-half of the acreage in the designated counties have been executed is in itself conclusive evidence that much remains to be done under the program. The most recent report of the Soil Conservation Service of wind erosion damage, covering the calendar quarter ending on February 28, 1969, starkly reveals the continuing severity of the problem.

ACRES OF LAND DAMAGED

Great Plains States	Number of counties reporting	Land damaged			Total land damaged	
		Crop-land	Range-land	Other land	Feb. 28, 1969	Feb. 29, 1968
Northern:						
Montana.....	15	20,650	-----	500	21,150	22,108
Nebraska.....	6	28,000	790	150	28,940	10,600
North Dakota.....	19	129,970	1,450	250	131,670	363,150
South Dakota.....	22	19,300	-----	-----	19,300	25,350
Wyoming.....	10	11,150	7,000	1,530	19,680	20,550
Subtotal.....	72	209,070	9,420	2,430	220,940	381,750
Southern:						
Colorado.....	10	16,125	20	5	16,150	6,160
Kansas.....	39	5,900	-----	-----	5,900	10,000
New Mexico.....	10	20,600	3,600	1,600	25,800	3,900
Oklahoma.....	17	34,531	47	102	34,680	1,200
Texas.....	56	365,510	8,600	13,710	387,820	56,020
Subtotal.....	132	442,666	12,267	15,417	470,350	77,280
Grand total.....	204	651,736	21,507	17,847	691,090	459,030

BACKGROUND

A. Developments culminating in passage of the 1956 legislation

In early 1956 the Great Plains Agricultural Council with assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture recommended a program for the Great Plains which was transmitted to the Congress by President Eisenhower. Public Law 84-1021 establishing the Great Plains conservation program was enacted in August of that year.

U.S. Department of Agriculture agency representatives at State levels, along with directors of extension and experiment stations, State agricultural agencies, governing bodies of soil and water conservation districts, and other agricultural leaders jointly reviewed

the hazardous wind erosion areas in each of the 10 States. They made recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture as to the boundaries that should be established for program participation and recommended the initial counties in each State to be eligible to participate. After the initial designation, other counties within the area were required to request designation by the Secretary, based on criteria established for program participation.

The recommendations for action, along with testimony during the hearings, made clear that a strong effort must be made to stabilize the resources of the Plains. In addition to the critical need to establish protective cover on large acreages of unstable land, the program was designed to achieve a more

stable agriculture, more dependable source of income, and a more satisfactory livelihood for the people of the region.

It was recognized that emergency treatment measures would not bring about this stability. A program to obtain complete conservation treatment on entire operating units as rapidly as possible was needed. The program, as developed under Public Law 84-1021, provides for technical as well as long-term cost-sharing assistance to help farmers and ranchers who are willing to install and maintain complete conservation on their units. Cost-share contracts range from not less than 3 years to not more than 10.

In order to allow as many farmers and ranchers as possible to get started on complete conservation plans, a limit of \$25,000 for any one unit was established. Experience has shown that contracts average about \$3,500 in Federal cost sharing spread over about 5½ years. This means about \$630 a year in Federal cost sharing is used by individuals on the average in carrying his conservation plan through to completion.

As of June 30, 1968, a total of 31,122 contracts covering 56,601,700 acres had been executed. The effect of the program in bringing about needed land-use adjustments is evidenced by the fact that producers have contracted to convert about 21 percent of their cropland to permanent cover. Nearly 15 percent of the cumulative cost-share payments paid to producers through June 30, 1968, was for the establishment of permanent grass on land previously used for cropland, and about 22 percent was for practices connected with the reestablishment of vegetative cover on range and pasturelands.

The average contract executed in fiscal year 1968 covered 1,604 acres with an average Federal cost-share obligation of \$3,471, as depicted on the following table:

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1968 AND CUMULATIVE TO JUNE 30, 1968

State	Great Plains contracts signed				Total, cost-share obligations			
	Number of designated counties		Acres		Fiscal year		To date	
	Fiscal year	To date	Fiscal year	To date	Fiscal year	To date	Fiscal year	To date
Colorado.....	36	263	519,008	6,831,684	\$1,266,970	\$12,238,197	317	317
Kansas.....	62	347	191,441	2,404,799	938,685	5,684,239	473	473
Montana.....	37	115	3,291	6,401,144	749,794	7,211,919	387	387
Nebraska.....	58	461	580,531	5,179,766	1,280,495	12,780,985	657	657
New Mexico.....	18	114	1,376	8,712,090	662,148	7,984,779	263	263
North Dakota.....	30	314	682,379	4,613,593	618,027	7,008,089	494	494
Oklahoma.....	30	568	467,486	3,052,331	1,351,067	8,584,191	908	908
South Dakota.....	39	197	3,294	4,581,300	684,779	6,657,893	348	348
Texas.....	99	803	480,716	12,746,546	2,793,238	33,984,772	1,073	1,073
Wyoming.....	11	45	721,431	2,078,447	259,163	2,794,801	99	99
Total.....	420	3,227	31,122	5,176,284	10,604,366	110,801,865	5,019	5,019
Average per contract.....	-----	-----	-----	1,604	3,286	3,471	-----	-----

1 Cumulative expenditures are about \$80,000,000, leaving a balance of \$28,000,000 unpaid cost-share obligations.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement he has prepared on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in my life I have seen too many severe extended droughts for them ever to be erased from my memory. Others of you here can also remember the looks of despair on the faces of those good people who were trying to farm or raise cattle on the highly erodible soils of the plains country, but were facing foreclosure,



and in some cases starvation, as the land dried up and blew away in drought days.

Those dust bowl days of the 1930's shocked the entire Nation. History books have accurate accounts of mass exodus of good people from the plains states.

In the late 1930's we began to develop programs to help stabilize this vast area, and typically we experienced a number of good moisture years, which gave us encouragement that those dark days of the 1930's would not appear again.

Another extended drought which eventually laid bare much of the plains again in the mid-1950's jolted us out of our complacency. High winds again whipped the bare soil, and people again were aroused and alarmed over the prospect of another dust bowl. Strong measures were necessary if we were to stabilize our farms and ranches and to reclaim our land, much of which should never have been plowed or grazed to begin with.

In 1956, Congress set into motion the Great Plains Conservation Program. For the first time we provided for a contractual partnership between the government and the farmers and ranchers to accelerate the planning and application of needed conservation treatment on entire farms or ranches over a specified period of years. This gave them assurance of continuous cost sharing until the job was completed—and helped them do it at a pace they could afford.

The area covered by this program is roughly that between the Mississippi/Missouri river systems on the east and the Rocky Mountains on the west, between the Canadian border on the north, and central West Texas on the south. This land was once the domain of the Indian and the buffalo, a vast treeless open area covered by a grassy sea. It is a harsh land, prey to great extremes of weather—drought and flood, cold and heat. And as the settlers came, the grass disappeared along with the Indians and the buffalo and with the grass went the limited ability of the hard, dry earth to hold water and the condition of the 1930's came about.

There are now 421 counties covered by this program, in ten Great Plains States. Nearly a fourth of them are in my home state. The population of this area is now in the vicinity of 20 million people.

We should consider too that the Federal cost sharing has been Society's cost of keeping the dust out of the air, silt from the streams, and assurance that this vast agricultural area will always be available to feed and clothe our population.

The Great Plains Conservation Program in Texas is a real success story. A recent survey conducted by the Soil Conservation Service showed that of the 4,050 farms and ranches visited, the owners of more than 9 out of 10 were keeping their conservation work at a satisfactory level. A fourth of this number had invested in further improvements.

Looking back over their experience in the Program, some landowners reported that they had gained in the process a clear understanding of the needs of their land. Others commented that their conservation work had given economic stability to their enterprises. Some of the smaller operators said that the added economic stability in their enterprises had enabled them to stay on their farms.

But, Mr. President, the job is not yet done. The Texas survey indicated that the work accomplished under the program in the 98 counties in the 11 years of activity amounts only to from 10 to 15 percent of the conservation work needed in the area. Achievements would have been even greater had the funds been sufficient to meet the requests of all of the applicants.

The current authority for the Great Plains Conservation Program expires on December 31, 1971. The strong beginning that we have made must be continued. We need at least

a 10-year extension of this Program to ensure the conservation of the Great Plains.

S. 1790, as reported out of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, provides for the extension of the Great Plains Conservation Program to December 31, 1981. It authorizes up to \$250 million to carry out this Program, nearly twice as much as was provided in the Act of August 7, 1956.

Mr. President, this legislation has my strongest support. I am hopeful that this distinguished body will consider it favorably and provide a new lease on life to one of this Country's most valuable conservation programs.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to amend section 16(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senate has passed S. 1790, a bill to extend the Great Plains conservation program for 10 years and to enlarge its scope in a number of minor respects.

It was my privilege on April 15 of this year to join Senator Young of North Dakota and several other colleagues as a cosponsor of S. 1790. The bill was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee from where it was reported favorably with certain amendments. The committee amendments are of a minor and generally technical nature, and the bill will still be substantially identical to the measure passed by the House of Representatives.

I have heartily supported the extension of the Great Plains conservation program and commend the Senate for its unanimous enactment of S. 1790.

The Great Plains conservation program was authorized in 1956 by the 84th Congress after being proposed and actively supported by the Eisenhower administration. This program represented a major step toward protecting and preserving the vast agricultural area of the Great Plains. It provided farmers and ranchers in the critically erodible areas with long-range, cost-sharing, and technical assistance, and contributed greatly to establishing well-planned conservation programs throughout this region. As of June 30, 1968, 31,122 cost-share contracts had been signed in the Great Plains area covering 56,601,700 acres, of which 18,732 contracts are still active on 37,449,169 acres.

In the 10-State area of the Midwest where the Great Plains conservation program has been authorized there are approximately 110 million acres of cropland and 215 million acres of range and pastureland. About 43 million acres of cropland and 91 million acres of range and pastureland and now have treatment adequate to meet the conservation needs of the area. It is apparent from these figures that more than half the cropland, range, and pastureland still needs conservation treatment.

Concentrated efforts have been and must continue to be made under this program to help the landowners and operators make needed land use changes. Much of the Great Plains area is suitable for production of cultivated crops

when needed conservation measures are properly applied. There are other areas of the Great Plains, however, that are not suited for cropland.

Of the acreage that has not yet been treated, about 5,500,000 acres of cropland and about 12,500,000 acres of range and pastureland are in great need of vegetative cover.

The Great Plains conservation program is helping participants convert these lands to permanent vegetative cover and to reseed denuded rangelands. Nearly 15 percent of the cumulative cost-share payments paid to producers through June 30, 1968, was for the establishment of permanent grass on land previously used for cropland, and about 22 percent was for practices connected with the reestablishment of vegetative cover on range and pasturelands.

The Great Plains conservation program is of substantial benefit to my State of Nebraska. Sixty counties in Nebraska are presently designated to receive assistance; many of these counties were subject to serious drought last year and will require extensive land treatment to prevent rapid erosion. As of January 1969, about 4,429 individual contracts had been entered into in Nebraska for cost-share assistance since the beginning of the program. These contracts cover about 5.5 million acres of Nebraska grassland. The amount expended for cost-share by the Federal Government in Nebraska has been about \$13.4 million since 1956.

In addition, there are now more than 600 applications pending from farmers and ranchers of Nebraska seeking assistance. Many thousands of acres were damaged last year in Nebraska, and other Midwest States, by wind erosion; crops or cover were destroyed by wind last year in this region on 351,280 acres where the land itself was not reported as being damaged; hundreds of thousands of acres being used for cropland at the time initial contracts were signed still need to be converted to permanent vegetative cover or to be reseeded.

Passage of S. 1790 will extend the life of this vital program for a sufficient period of time to accomplish more adequately the conservation of our land resources in the Midwest. It is on this land that a substantial portion of our national grain and livestock production takes place.

For these reasons, I joined as a cosponsor of S. 1790.

On behalf of the farmers and ranchers of the Great Plains area, I want to express my appreciation to my colleagues in the Senate for extending this vital program.

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1076) to establish in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth dur-



ing the summer months in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary. The Corps shall be open to youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications: *Provided, however*, That preference shall be given to disadvantaged youth. Employment preference for temporary supervisory personnel shall be given to primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators, and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resources disciplines.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine the areas under their administrative jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out programs using employees of the Corps. The rates and hours and other conditions of employment in the Corps shall be as jointly determined by the two Secretaries: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees other than for the purposes of the Act of June 25, 1948, as amended (28 U.S.C. 2671 et seq.), and the Act of September 6, 1966 (5 U.S.C. 8102 et seq.). The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of Corps members. No member of the Corps may be employed for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the the Corps in their duties. To minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall, insofar as is feasible, be employed on conservation projects nearest to their place of residence.

(d) Wherever feasible and appropriate, vacated Civilian Conservation Centers and other unoccupied facilities maintained and operated by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture shall be utilized for the purposes of this program. Unoccupied military facilities shall also be utilized where appropriate and necessary, and upon approval by the Secretary of Defense.

(e) The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to other temporary program support staff.

SEC. 3. (a) Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Secretaries of the Interior

and Agriculture shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall further transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

(b) The Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture shall prepare a joint report, indicating the feasibility of initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource conservation or outdoor recreation agencies. This report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act. The President shall further transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

SEC. 4. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on February 18 I introduced S. 1076, a bill to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program for young men and women, 14 to 18 years of age. These young Americans would participate in summer work and educational projects in our national parks, forests, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, and other public lands administered by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture for periods up to 90 days. This program is seen as a step toward developing a valuable public resource—our lands—while at the same time benefiting our greatest national asset—our youth.

At a time when there is great national concern for the maintenance of the natural environment and for meeting the burgeoning demands for outdoor recreation, measures need to be taken to intensify resource management programs. If the future leaders of our Nation are to be expected to understand that the great out-of-doors has a relevant role in their lives, they must experience the sense of accomplishment in completing a difficult task, of understanding the intricacies of land and water conservation and management, and of working in programs to assure that future generations of Americans will enjoy life in a quality environment.

These young men and women would be employed in a variety of conservation duties. They would help to reduce the tremendous backlog of maintenance and development work necessary in our park and recreation lands. The Corps members would be expected to perform a variety of projects including timber stand improvement, trail maintenance, wildlife habitat improvement, basic soil and water conservation duties, and maintenance and construction of campgrounds and picnic facilities.

I want to emphasize that this bill authorizes appropriations to support a 3-year pilot program for approximately 3,000 youth each year. The pilot program is authorized to minimize the program costs and to provide data for an annual program analysis report to determine if the Corps is fulfilling the intended objectives of the act. Before the life of the program can be extended, or its

size increased beyond the third year of the program, the program would be reviewed and new legislation would be required.

If the pilot program is successful, as I hope it will be, it can be continued and expanded into a permanent program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-270), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE OF THE MEASURE

The purpose of this legislation, which was introduced by Senator Jackson for himself and 26 cosponsors, is to establish a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program for young men and women, 14-18 years of age, who would participate in summer work and educational projects in our national parks, forests, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, and other public lands administered by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture for periods up to 90 days. Corps members would be employed by the Department of Interior or Agriculture, without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary. This program is seen as a step toward developing a valuable public resource—our lands—while at the same time benefiting our greatest national asset—our youth.

In addition to providing work experience, the program is envisioned as an opportunity to benefit the young enrollees by—

(1) Enhancing their understanding of the natural environment and its relationship to them;

(2) Stimulating high school youth who are capable of attaining greater goals, but presently lack motivation or direction in school, and

(3) Providing a forum for discussion and mutual understanding between youth of all socioeconomic and racial origins.

The bill authorizes appropriations to support a 3-year pilot program for approximately 3000 youth each year. If the pilot program is successful, it can be continued and expanded into a permanent program.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amended the bill by deleting all after the enacting clause, and substituting language to adopt, in substance, suggestions made by the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, as well as the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Bureau of the Budget.

The effect of the committee amendments are as follows:

1. The title of the bill was changed to reflect the fact that the Youth Conservation Corps is initially to be operated as a pilot program.

2. Specific language was added stating that membership in the Corps shall be open to youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications; however, a preference is to be extended to disadvantaged youngsters.

3. A second preference clause was added to indicate that the preferred source of temporary staff personnel is to be primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators, and university students in the field of education and natural resources.

4. A provision was included which charges the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture with the responsibility of promulgating regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of Corps members.

5. Language was added to provide that, insofar as is feasible, Corps members will be



employed on conservation projects nearest their place of residence.

6. Language was added to authorize the use of existing Federal facilities, wherever feasible, for operation of the program.

7. A provision was added to exclude temporary supervisory personnel and program support staff from consideration under the provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968.

8. A new section 3 was added directing the preparation of an annual program review report to the President and the Congress by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture.

9. Section 3 further directs the preparation of a report by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, indicating the feasibility of initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource conservation or other outdoor recreation agencies.

10. A new section 4 was added which authorizes appropriations for the pilot Youth Conservation Corps for a 3-year period, with the appropriation level not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually.

#### BACKGROUND

Several bills have been introduced in Congress during the past 10 years to establish youth conservation programs, although they differed in either scope or objective from S. 1076. This also applies to the civilian conservation centers operated under the Job Corps program which offer full-time employment for disadvantaged, out-of-school youth.

Section 101 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended by Public Law 90-222, authorizes the creation of the Job Corps in which unemployed, out-of-school, 14- to 22-year-old men and women could enroll for up to 2 years. According to section 106 of this act, no less than 40 percent of the male Job Corps enrollees were to be engaged in natural resource management work at civilian conservation centers. As of March 31, 1969, the capacity for civilian conservation center enrollees totaled 14,371. This number is to be reduced to 5,896, effective June 30, 1969.

Section 120 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, authorizes the creation of a work-training program: the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Enrollees of this program conduct such duties as beautification projects and improvements and maintenance of school buildings, parks, and recreation facilities. Of the 364,000 youth enrolled in the 1968 summer Neighborhood Youth Corps program, approximately 600 conducted conservation work in connection with the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

#### NEED

S. 1076 is designed to provide summer employment opportunities for youth, primarily those from urban areas, who have varying economic, social and racial backgrounds. Far too many young Americans never have an opportunity to receive meaningful work experiences. Because of the summer employment problems in urban areas, young men and women often turn from walking the streets seeking job to roaming the streets in pursuit of mischief.

More than a year ago, the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders reported that the lack of substantial employment opportunities for the youth trapped in urban ghettos was one of the principal causes of riots. The youth of these areas were characterized as encountering a life of despair and hopelessness. The Commission recommended greatly expanded training and employment opportunities for ghetto youth as the primary component of an attack on the causes of urban poverty. The Youth Conservation Corps would reach many of these young men and women and demonstrate to them that they can play a significant role in the functioning of our society.

At a time when there is great national concern for the maintenance of the natural environment and for meeting the burgeoning demands for outdoor recreation, measures need to be taken to intensify resource management programs. If the future leaders of our Nation are to be expected to understand that the great out-of-doors has a relevant role in their lives, they must experience the sense of accomplishment in completing a difficult task, of understanding the intricacies of land and water conservation and management, and of working in programs to assure that future generations of Americans will enjoy life in a quality environment.

These young men and women would be employed in a variety of conservation duties. They would help to reduce the tremendous backlog of maintenance and development work necessary in our park and recreation lands. The Corps members would be expected to perform a variety of projects including timber stand improvement, trail maintenance, wildlife habitat improvement, basic soil and water conservation duties, and maintenance and construction of campgrounds and picnic facilities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes."

#### EXTENSION OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT, 1949

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 122) to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2032), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 30, 1969."

#### ARTHUR RIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 229, S. 1932.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 1932) for the relief of Arthur Rike.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the chairman of the minority calendar committee, to have printed in the RECORD a statement and an insertion concerning the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. FANNIN. When a bill identical to S. 1932 was being considered by the Senate last year on September 18, I had some comments to make regarding it.

I include my statement in the RECORD on S. 2214 in the 90th Congress, on September 18, 1968, together with a copy of the deposition of a postal inspector to which I referred in that statement, in the RECORD at this point. (See exhibit 1.)

#### EXHIBIT 1

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, this bill, sponsored by Senator BURDICK, would confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the District of North Dakota to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim by Arthur Rike. It would waive the defenses of the United States based on the statute of limitations, laches, or any previous proceedings in said district court.

The report of the Post Office Department on this bill to the Committee on the Judiciary states in part as follows:

"Our records disclose that on February 23, 1967, Arthur Rike filed a civil tort action in the District Court, First Judicial District, Grand Forks, N. Dak., against David John Mersey a postal employee. The suit demanded damages of \$37,905 for alleged injuries sustained by Mr. Rike as a result of a collision on December 24, 1964, between Mr. Rike's automobile and that of Mr. Mersey, who was acting within the scope of his Federal employment. At the request of the assistant U.S. attorney the action was removed to the U.S. District Court for the District of North Dakota pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2679(d), and the United States was substituted as a party defendant in place of Mr. Mersey. The Government then moved to dismiss the suit on the ground that plaintiff's cause of action was barred by the 2-year Federal statute of limitations, 28 U.S.C. 2401(b). The court granted the Government's motion, dismissing the suit on November 19, 1967.

"The Department opposes enactment of S. 2214. This bill would, in effect, nullify the above court proceedings and allow Mr. Rike an additional year within which to bring suit. In the 82d Congress this committee, in its report on Senate Joint Resolution 23, declared that it "would not relieve a claimant of a statute of limitations except for 'good cause' shown \* \* \*." We see no evidence of "good cause" in this case to grant the relief which would be afforded by S. 2214."

The sponsor of the bill takes exception to the position of the Post Office Department that there was no showing of a "good cause" for extending the statute of limitations. He states:

"I feel that I must take exception to this. Mr. Rike was lulled into believing that the U.S. Government was not a party to claims arising out of an automobile accident in which he and David John Mersy were the drivers. The only reason that action was not filed within the statute of limitations is a belief on the part of Mr. Rike and his attorney, supported by statements made by representatives of the insurance company and the U.S. Post Office, that the Government was not a party to this suit. In a deposition taken by Mr. Rike's attorney, the postal inspector did not deny that he had made such a statement.

"I firmly believe that this is a good and sufficient cause for the Judiciary Committee to favorably report S. 2214. The only thing this bill would do is to give Arthur Rike the day in court which he has so far been denied."

The statement that Mr. Rike "was lulled into believing the U.S. Government was not a party to claims arising out of" this accident has been noted. However, a copy of the deposition of the postal inspector referred to by the sponsor of the bill has been made available by the Post Office Department. Its contents are relevant to this question. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the deposition be printed at this point in the RECORD.



# PLATE 100

THE  
GREAT  
HALL  
OF  
THE  
MUSEUM  
OF  
ARTS  
AND  
CRAFTS  
LONDON

1884

THE  
GREAT  
HALL  
OF  
THE  
MUSEUM  
OF  
ARTS  
AND  
CRAFTS  
LONDON





# H. R. 15361

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 19, 1969

Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. ESCH) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

## A BILL

To establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 POLICY AND PURPOSE

4 SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employ-  
5 ment of American youth, representing all segments of society,  
6 in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national  
7 park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife  
8 refuge system, and other public land and water areas creates  
9 an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the  
10 Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is  
11 the purpose of this Act to further the development and main-

1 tenance of the natural resources of the United States by the  
2 youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for  
3 maintaining and managing these resources for the American  
4 people.

5 YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

6 SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there  
7 is hereby established a Youth Conservation Corps Inter-  
8 agency Committee composed of representatives of the De-  
9 partments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor who shall  
10 administer a three-year pilot program designated as the  
11 Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the  
12 "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women  
13 who are permanent residents of the United States, its terri-  
14 tories, or possessions who have attained age fourteen but have  
15 not attained age nineteen, and whom the Youth Conservation  
16 Corps Interagency Committee may employ, without regard  
17 for civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations,  
18 for the purposes of providing gainful employment, generating  
19 understanding, and developing, preserving, or maintaining  
20 lands and waters of the United States.

21 (b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and  
22 youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no  
23 person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term  
24 in excess of ninety days during any single year.



1 YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

2 SEC. 3. (a) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency  
3 Committee shall be composed of six persons. The Secretaries  
4 of the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor  
5 shall each designate two persons to serve on the Youth Con-  
6 servation Corps Interagency Committee, with one, at least,  
7 of the two designees being an employee of the respective  
8 department. Each member of the Interagency Committee  
9 shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary appointing him.  
10 The Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor,  
11 in consultation, shall name the Chairman of the Interagency  
12 Committee.

13 (b) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Com-  
14 mittee shall:

15 (1) designate the public lands upon which members  
16 of the Corps can be effectively utilized in conservation  
17 work, and coordinate Corps efforts with those holding  
18 jurisdiction over the respective public lands;

19 (2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other  
20 conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That  
21 members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal  
22 employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171  
23 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5,  
24 United States Code;

1           (3) arrange for transportation, lodging, subsistence,  
2           other services and equipment for the needs of members  
3           of the Corps in fulfilling their duties: *Provided*, That  
4           whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied  
5           Federal facilities (including abandoned military installa-  
6           tions) shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps,  
7           *And provided further*, That to minimize transportation  
8           costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation  
9           projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

10           (4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety,  
11           health, and welfare of the Corps members;

12           (5) give employment preference for temporary  
13           supervisory personnel to primary, secondary, and uni-  
14           versity teachers and administrators and university stu-  
15           dents pursuing studies in the education and natural re-  
16           source disciplines;

17           (6) prepare a report, indicating the most efficient  
18           method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation  
19           program with State natural resource, conservation, or  
20           outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be sub-  
21           mitted to the President not later than one year following  
22           enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for  
23           review and appropriate action.

24           (c) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Ex-



1 penditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall  
2 not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary  
3 supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support  
4 staff.

5 INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE REPORTS

6 SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program,  
7 the Interagency Committee shall prepare a joint report de-  
8 tailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the  
9 purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each  
10 report shall be submitted to the President not later than one  
11 hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's  
12 pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the  
13 Congress for review and appropriate action.

14 AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

15 SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this  
16 Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts  
17 not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to  
18 the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee to  
19 carry out the purposes of this Act.

91ST CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

**H. R. 15361**

---

## **A BILL**

---

To establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. MEEDS, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. ESCH

---

DECEMBER 19, 1969

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor









# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of March 17, 1970  
91st-2nd; No. 41

### CONTENTS

Appropriations.....13	Housing.....16	Pollution.....5
Economy.....10	Interest rates.....10,16	Safety.....9
Environment.....5	Lands.....8	Salmon fishing.....11
Farm worker.....10	Land utilization.....15	Sulphur imports.....14
FHA.....10	Migrant housing.....3	VietNam land reform.....12
Finances.....7	Packaging.....9	Wheat.....1
Fire research.....6	Pesticides.....5	Youth Corps.....2
Foreign trade.....4		

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed Tulelake area Durum wheat allotment bill. House committee reported Youth Conservation Corps bill. Rep. Mahon inserted schedule for committee reporting and House consideration of appropriation bills. Sen. Aiken, et al, and Rep. Dellenback introduced and Sen. Aiken discussed land utilization bill.

### HOUSE

1. WHEAT. By voice vote passed S. 858, in lieu of H. R. 485, to increase permanently from 8,000 to 12,000 acres the aggregate wheat allotments in the Tulelake area of Calif. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H1859-61
2. YOUTH CORPS. The Education and Labor Committee reported H. R. 15361, to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (H. Rept. No. 91-915). p. H1887

3. MIGRANT HOUSING. Rep. Hutchinson stated that "The unrealistic and impractical application of the standards" for migrant labor housing is creating problems for the growers. p. H1862
4. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Dent criticized foreign trade policies stating that far-reaching economic changes have occurred "yet the national trade policy continues with very little change." pp. H1865-7
5. ENVIRONMENT; POLLUTION; PESTICIDES. Rep. Monagan discussed the provisions of his bill which would establish a Presidential Council on the Environment, spoke on the threat of pesticide contamination saying "there must be a balancing of risks and the potential hazard to health cannot be continually ignored as the Department of Agriculture consistently has done." pp. H1869-71
6. FIRE RESEARCH. Both Houses received from Commerce Department a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to carry out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968; to S. Commerce and H. Science and Astronautics Committee. pp. S3814, H1887
7. FINANCES. Both Houses received from Treasury Dept. the annual report on the state of finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969 (H. Doc. 91-228); to S. Finance and H. Ways and Means Committees. pp. S3814, H1887

SENATE

8. RECREATION; LANDS. Passed as reported H. R. 3786, to authorize additional funds for acquisition of land for Point Reyes National Seashore. pp. S3821-25
9. PACKAGING; SAFETY. The Committee on Commerce ordered reported, but did not actually report, S. 2162, to authorize the establishment of standards for the child-resistant packaging of hazardous substances. p. D244
10. ECONOMY. Sen. Bible inserted news articles which show that the large interest rates are available only to large investors, and special reference is made to FHA securities. pp. S3835-37  
Sen. Miller inserted the Economic Club address by Secretary Stans in which is stated that one American farm worker produces enough to feed 42 people. pp. S3832-34  
Sen. Talmadge stated that "the most serious issue of economic policy at the present time is the excessively tight monetary policy that has been pursued by the Federal Reserve System". p. S3820
11. SALMON FISHING. Sen. Magnuson reported that South Korean fishermen threaten North Pacific salmon resources. p. S3837
12. VIETNAM LAND REFORM. Senators Packwood and Magnuson hailed the passage of land reform legislation in VietNam. pp. S3821 and S3828



## YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS ACT

---

MARCH 17, 1970.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. MEEDS, from the Committee on Education and Labor,  
submitted the following

### REPORT

together with

### MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 15361]

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 15361), having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

### INTRODUCTION

The 1930's were a decade of experiments, and few Government innovations proved more successful than the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). Moving into the countryside away from the torment of idleness and human despair, 3 million anxious boys found work, learned more about nature and themselves, and enriched the Nation with thousands of monuments: new trails, improved watersheds, additional fish hatcheries, intensified soil conservation. The Civilian Conservation Corps was a delightful success in human and resource rehabilitation.

In June of last year, unemployment among youths ages 14 to 18 was 16.4 percent. Violence and drugs occupy the national conscience. Cities fester. Lucky youths go to bed tired from a hard day's work. Less fortunate youngsters hear police sirens and wonder about new clothes for school in September, about their own worth, and about the value of an adult society that insists they grow up but that can't give them jobs and responsibility.

Neglect of a budgetary nature frustrates Federal land management; 4.8 million acres of national forest lands have been cut over but not

reseeded. In the Olympic National Park are 600 miles of trails that the staff has never been able to open completely or maintain.

The Olympic National Park is also the site of a student conservation program operated in conjunction with the Seattle schools. Youngsters perform tasks similar to those of the CCC enrollees. This year there is room for 250 teenagers in the program. Three thousand applications have already been received by Project Supervisor Jack Dolstad.

#### PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The Youth Conservation Corps would be a 3-year pilot program employing roughly 3,000 young people ages 14-18 each year during the summer on public lands.

The legislation offers youngsters an opportunity to work together out of doors, to shoulder the responsibility of wage earning, and to aid in the conservation of our natural resources. Entrance requirements will not be based on income.

Working together toward wise conservation, enrollees in the program would receive instruction leading to a healthier understanding and appreciation of our environment.

In refreshing contrast to our overabundance of cynicism and apathy, young people today are viewing the environment with what President Kennedy once termed "idealism without illusions." Youth is in the vanguard of the movement to save man from his tendency to dig, dispose, and destroy. Testimony taken by the committee demonstrated remarkable willingness to work to protect nature. Near San Francisco, for example, the Sierra Club conducted a 2-day volunteer project that saw 150 young people plant 12,000 trees.

Senator Henry M. Jackson, sponsor of the Senate Youth Conservation Corps measure, reminded the committee that 70 percent of our people live on 1 percent of the land. The demand for open space is both physical and psychological. Thousands of youngsters have little opportunity to enjoy nature.

The Youth Conservation Corps will create public benefits and pay back a large dividend for our investment. As mentioned above, there are 4.8 million acres of national forest land needing replanting. Each year, more than 14 billion board feet of public timber are lost to fire, insects, and disease. Recreational use of the public lands is skyrocketing. National park visitations are expected to double between 1968 and the early 1970's and could increase 10 times by the year 2000. Trails, campsites, roads, picnic grounds, watersheds, fish stocking—all must be increased and maintained.

Equally important is the sense of personal satisfaction and self-value young people will acquire. Louis Clapper, testifying for the National Wildlife Federation, told the committee of his own son who, at age 18, landed a summer job in the national forests in Colorado.

"He made the trip out and back by himself," said Mr. Clapper. "He performed recreation area garbage cleanup, marked trees, repaired trails, and even performed a bit of firefighting. On the weekend, he visited the ranch of a Spanish-American coworker and helped brand calves. All of these were first-time experiences he shall never forget."

The Youth Conservation Corps, like the old Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, can be the kind of personal bootstrap experience needed to propel a young fellow upward in the world.



Raymond Swanson, appearing for the Western Forest Industries Association, told the committee of a personal friend:

A good friend of mine arrived in Oregon from New Haven many years ago as a poverty-stricken youth in the Civilian Conservation Corps. He was put to work in the woods, and when he finally left the CCC, he got a job in a lumber mill and went on to acquire his own business.

Over the years he has prospered greatly. And the investment the Government made in him he has plowed back. He has been a prominent member of our State legislature. He has been a member of the Oregon Board of Forestry. He is a member of the small group that has brought a modern hospital to his community.

#### COMMITTEE ACTION

Congressman Lloyd Meeds, of Washington, together with Congressman Wendell Wyatt, of Oregon, introduced H.R. 11145 on May 12, 1969. Similar bills, H.R. 11412 and H.R. 14260, were introduced by Congressmen Foley and Hanna.

The Select Subcommittee on Labor held hearings in Washington, D.C., on October 22 and 23, 1969. Testimony was presented by Arnold Weber, Assistant Secretary for Manpower, Department of Labor. He was accompanied by William H. Kolberg, Associate Manpower Administrator of Policy. Numerous public witnesses also appeared.

H.R. 15361, a clean bill, was reported by the subcommittee with amendments on December 16, 1969, and has been reported favorably from the Education and Labor Committee with bipartisan support.

Introduced by Representative Meeds, H.R. 15361 is cosponsored by Representatives Daniels of New Jersey, Perkins, Green of Oregon, Thompson of New Jersey, Dent, Brademas, Carey, Hawkins, William D. Ford, Hathaway, Mink, Burton, Scheuer, Gaydos, Stokes, Clay, Powell and Esch.

An identical measure, H.R. 15362, was cosponsored by Representatives Foley, Adams, Hicks, Hansen of Washington, May, Pelly, Wyatt, Kastenmeier, Saylor, Dingell, Howard and Sandman.

#### GROUPS FAVORING YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Support for the Youth Conservation Corps has been expressed by many groups. Among them are the Sierra Club, the Western Forest Industries Association, the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts of America, the National Wildlife Federation, the National Association of Counties, the National Rifle Association, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the Izaak Walton League, the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, the American Forestry Association, the National Recreation and Parks Association, the National Forest Products Association and the National Audubon Society.

## PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

This legislation establishes a Youth Conservation Corps Inter-Agency Committee composed of representatives of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor to administer the Youth Conservation Corps. The Corps will consist of both boys and girls, ages 14 through 18, and from all social, economic, and racial backgrounds. No one will be employed by the Corps in excess of 90 days in any year. Efforts will be made to locate enrollees close to home.

The Inter-Agency Committee would designate the public lands upon which members of the Corps could be utilized effectively in conservation work. The committee would also determine the rates of pay, hours and other conditions of employment. In addition, this legislation would provide employment preference for supervisory personnel to teachers, administrators, and university students pursuing studies in education and natural resources. The Inter-Agency Committee must also prepare a report describing how best to initiate a State-local-Federal cost-sharing program for a Youth Conservation Corps that would work on State and municipal lands. The report shall be submitted to the President and to Congress 1 year after enactment of this act. To assess effectiveness, a report must be filed by the committee not later than 180 days following completion of each year's pilot program.

### NOT A DUPLICATION

The Youth Conservation Corps would not represent a duplication in Federal effort. The only other Federal program which might be comparable is the Neighborhood Youth Corps. However, for the most part, the Neighborhood Youth Corps is not a conservation program. Of the 364,000 enrollees in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in 1968, only about 600 were engaged in conservation work on Federal lands. In 1969 this 600 figure had risen to 1,472. In addition, the National Park Service had 779 summer trainees.

The committee heard numerous witnesses testify that local youth conservation programs carried a highly favorable impact on the child when he returned to classes in September. Dropout rates were lower, grades were higher, and attitudes were more positive. It was felt that success and accomplishment during the summer imbued the youngster with new confidence.

Besides older teenagers, the Youth Conservation Corps would include boys and girls 14 and 15 years of age. Younger teenagers can do much useful conservation work without using potentially dangerous tools. However, experience has shown that when young people do use such tools they do so cautiously and according to instruction.

The summer months comprise the period of heaviest use of public lands and the time when temporary labor is most urgently needed. Experience with the old Civilian Conservation Corps and with more recent programs has shown that much conservation work can be accomplished within 90 days.

To provide instruction there is a great reservoir of high school and university teaching talent available during the summer months for



possible employment. College students pursuing courses in education and natural resources can also serve as instructional assistants.

#### APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Section 5 provides that for 3 years not more than \$3.5 million shall be appropriated annually to carry out the purposes of the act. The cost of this program would represent a wise investment in comparison with the value of the program.

In considering dollar costs, immediate consideration should be given to the fact that expenditure for the Youth Conservation Corps program would represent not only investment in improvement of the public lands but also investment in the growth potential of our youthful citizens.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

##### *Section 1—Policy and purpose*

This section states that it is the purpose of this act to further the development and natural resources of the United States by providing work opportunities for American youth, representing all segments of society, through employment in conservation work on our public lands.

##### *Section 2—Youth Conservation Corps*

(a) This section provides for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee composed of representatives of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor to administer a 3-year pilot program called the Youth Conservation Corps.

The Corps shall consist of both men and women ages 14 through 18 who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories or possessions, employed without regard to civil service rules or regulations.

(b) The Corps shall include both sexes, all social, economic and racial classifications, with no one to be employed by the Corps in excess of 90 days in any year.

##### *Section 3—Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee*

(a) This section provides for a Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee. The Secretaries of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor shall each appoint two persons to serve on the committee, at least one of the two designees being an employee of that respective Department. Each appointee shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary appointing him.

The three appointing Secretaries in consultation shall name the Chairman from among the six appointees.

(b) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee shall:

(1) Designate the public lands upon which members of the Corps can be effectively utilized in conservation work.

(2) Determine the rates of pay, hours and other conditions of employment. Corps members are not deemed Federal employees for purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

(3) Arrange for transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment with provisos for reducing economic costs.

(4) Regulate health and safety of Corps members.

(5) Provide employment preference for supervisory personnel to teachers, administrators and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resources disciplines.

(6) Prepare a report indicating methods for initiating a cost-sharing Youth Conservation program, which report shall be submitted to the President and Congress 1 year after enactment of this act.

(c) Provides that title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 does not apply.

#### *Section 4—Interagency committee reports*

Provides for filing of a report by the committee not later than 180 days following completion of each year's pilot program.

#### *Section 5—Authorization of funds*

Provides that for 3 years not more than \$3.5 million shall be appropriated annually to carry out the purposes of the act.



## MINORITY VIEWS

We oppose enactment of the committee bill, H.R. 15361, and urge that it be rejected by the House of Representatives.

Our objections to the bill may be summarized as follows:

(1) It would establish another "categorical" manpower program and would therefore be contrary to the comprehensive approach taken in the President's manpower message and the administration's proposed Manpower Training Act.

(2) It does not provide ancillary manpower services necessary for skill development of enrollees and the operation of an effective, efficient, and practical program.

(3) It imposes an unreasonably short limitation on the length of enrollment.

(4) It does not provide preference for the disadvantaged.

(5) It overlaps existing, more effective Federal programs.

(6) It fails to place primary responsibility for administering the program in the Department of Labor, in consultation with the Department of Agriculture and the Interior.

(7) It does not require coordination with other Federal manpower and job training programs for youth.

The bill reported by the committee would establish a Youth Conservation Corps to provide short term employment opportunities to young men and women of all socioeconomic backgrounds.

The bill is an employment measure which adds another categorical program to existing manpower development and training efforts. In this connection, the bill is contrary to the goal established by the President in his manpower message to the Congress in which he recommended the establishment of a total approach to the Nation's manpower effort as is proposed in the administration's bill, the Manpower Training Act (H.R. 13472).

We recognize that there is a need for effective conservation programs both in the light of the increasing demands being made on existing outdoor recreational facilities, as well as the need to develop additional accommodations to satisfy the ever growing demand for such facilities. Also, there is no argument against the need to instill in our youth an appreciation of our natural environment and heritage. Therefore, it becomes a matter of fitting these aims within the framework of existing priorities.

The bill, while designed to make youth aware of the need for conservation, does not provide a sound basis for supplying and developing the needed trained manpower to meet the current and anticipated demand for outdoor recreational facilities and services. What is needed is a coordinated and all-inclusive program for youth as part of a comprehensive manpower program.

In this regard, the committee bill does not offer an efficient and practical way for developing the occupational skills of young men and women, and as such would be ineffective toward providing a

meaningful work experience to the youngsters enrolled. While the purpose of the legislation—to conserve our natural resources and provide a greater appreciation of the importance of maintaining them—has merit, we believe that this objective may be advanced more constructively through other methods.

The bill makes no mention of improving employability, job placement, skill training or any of the other components necessary to develop an effective, efficient and practical manpower program that will enhance the occupational skills of the enrollees. Without the full development of each of these components no sound basis will be established for furnishing the trained manpower needed to carry out useful conservation activities.

The committee bill indicates that the youths employed would be provided with gainful employment, which would generate in them an understanding for developing, preserving, and maintaining our natural resources. Because of the 90-day limitation on the enrollment period, the time likely needed for acclimatization, orientation, and physical conditioning, would leave little time for an effectual and useful work experience. Without extensive instruction or vocational training such needed projects as developing new campsites, water control, timber stand improvement and other basic forest, soil and conservation measures would appear to be beyond the accomplishments of the youths employed. In general, it would appear that the youths enrolled have to be either assigned to perform the simplest duties involving only light work and simple hand tools, or to cleanup activities.

While the bill envisions a summer employment period in a healthful outdoor rural environment, it appears to overlook the various employment and work experience programs already in operation and which in many instances have conservation components. The Federal Government has many summer work programs which are designed to meet the needs of our young people, and specific projects have involved such conservation activities as maintenance, beautification, painting, planting and other conservation tasks that can safely be performed by the inexperienced youths enrolled. The committee bill overlaps a number of programs presently authorized for youths which provide them not only with exposure to work experience, but many of these programs also encompass various supportive services, such as counseling, orientation, and frequently remedial education. We believe that the needs of our youth, in terms of summer programs, can best be served by those operations that have been successful in the past. Included would be such programs as summer job opportunities made available by various Federal agencies, the summer JOBS program sponsored by the National Alliance of Businessmen, Neighborhood Youth Corps summer positions, the Vice President's summer employment program, and the funneling of Office of Economic Opportunity funds to local community groups for summer youth programs.

We are concerned with section 2(b) of the committee bill. This section provides that the program shall be open to youth of all socioeconomic classifications without any preference being established for the disadvantaged or the unemployed. We submit that children from families in the middle and upper income brackets are already



the best equipped, and in the best position to compete for training, education, and jobs. As a result, it has been found essential that manpower programs, including those directed toward youth in the summer months, contain a preference for disadvantaged persons. The maintaining of this priority in such a program as that established by the committee bill is necessary in order to reach those youngsters most in need of opportunities for work experience and a healthful change of atmosphere as well as providing them with an opportunity to acquire some income.

Employment alone is not enough to meet the needs of disadvantaged youth. Supportive services and skill training must be provided to equip an individual to seek and obtain gainful employment. What is needed is not more fragmentation and categorical programs but a single comprehensive and unified manpower and training program in which all of the parts mesh with each other. The hydra-headed administrative authority established by the committee bill is a sure prescription for administrative confusion and inefficiency. There can be no doubt that effective administration of such programs is best attained by lodging final authority in a single official of cabinet rank. In this particular case it should be the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretaries of Agriculture and of the Interior.

Nor does the bill anywhere require coordination with other manpower and job training programs for youth. There is nothing in the bill to suggest that it is designed for any objectives other than helping to preserve our natural resources and providing useful work experience to the young people who will be engaged in that endeavor. That being so, the bill's failure to provide even a medium of cooperation with other Federal manpower and job training programs appears to be not only without precedent but without justification.

For these reasons we are convinced that the bill, as reported, should not pass.

JOHN N. ERLNBORN.  
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE.  
JOHN DELLENBACK.  
WILLIAM A. STEIGER.  
JAMES M. COLLINS.





91<sup>ST</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 15361

[Report No. 91-915]

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 19, 1969

Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. ESCH) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

MARCH 17, 1970

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union  
and ordered to be printed

---

## A BILL

To establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 POLICY AND PURPOSE

4 SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employ-  
5 ment of American youth, representing all segments of society,  
6 in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national  
7 park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife  
8 refuge system, and other public land and water areas creates  
9 an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the

1 Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is  
2 the purpose of this Act to further the development and main-  
3 tenance of natural resources of the United States by the  
4 youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for  
5 maintaining and managing these resources for the American  
6 people.

7 YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

8 SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there  
9 is hereby established a Youth Conservation Corps Inter-  
10 agency Committee composed of representatives of the De-  
11 partments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor who shall  
12 administer a three-year pilot program designated as the  
13 Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the  
14 "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women  
15 who are permanent residents of the United States, its terri-  
16 tories, or possessions who have attained age fourteen but  
17 have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Youth Con-  
18 servation Corps Interagency Committee may employ, with-  
19 out regard for civil service or classification laws, rules, or  
20 regulations, for the purposes of providing gainful employ-  
21 ment, generating understanding, and developing, preserving,  
22 or maintaining lands and waters of the United States.

23 (b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and  
24 youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with  
25 no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a  
26 term in excess of ninety days during any single year.



1 YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

2 SEC. 3. (a) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency  
3 Committee shall be composed of six persons. The Secretaries  
4 of the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor  
5 shall each designate two persons to serve on the Youth Con-  
6 servation Corps Interagency Committee, with one, at least,  
7 of the two designees being an employee of the respective  
8 department. Each member of the Interagency Committee  
9 shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary appointing him.  
10 The Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor,  
11 in consultation, shall name the Chairman of the Interagency  
12 Committee.

13 (b) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Com-  
14 mittee shall:

15 (1) designate the public lands upon which members  
16 of the Corps can be effectively utilized in conservation  
17 work, and coordinate Corps efforts with those holding  
18 jurisdiction over the respective public lands;

19 (2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other  
20 conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That  
21 members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal  
22 employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171  
23 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5,  
24 United States Code;

25 (3) arrange for transportation, lodging, subsistence,

1 other services and equipment for the needs of members  
2 of the Corps in fulfilling their duties: *Provided*, That  
3 whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied  
4 Federal facilities (including abandoned military installa-  
5 tions) shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps;  
6 *And provided further*, That to minimize transportation  
7 costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation  
8 projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

9 (4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety;  
10 health, and welfare of the Corps members;

11 (5) give employment preference for temporary  
12 supervisory personnel to primary, secondary, and uni-  
13 versity teachers and administrators and university stu-  
14 dents pursuing studies in the education and natural re-  
15 source disciplines;

16 (6) prepare a report, indicating the most efficient  
17 method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation  
18 program with State natural resource, conservation, or  
19 outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be sub-  
20 mitted to the President not later than one year following  
21 enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for  
22 review and appropriate action.

23 (c) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Ex-  
24 penditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall  
25 not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary



1 supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support  
2 staff.

3 INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE REPORTS

4 SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program,  
5 the Interagency Committee shall prepare a joint report de-  
6 tailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the  
7 purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each  
8 report shall be submitted to the President not later than one  
9 hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's  
10 pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the  
11 Congress for review and appropriate action.

12 AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

13 SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this  
14 Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts  
15 not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to  
16 the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee to  
17 carry out the purposes of this Act.

[Report No. 91-915]

---

---

**A BILL**

---

---

To establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

---

---

By Mr. MEEDS, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HAGHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHUEFER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. ESCH

---

---

DECEMBER 19, 1969

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

MARCH 17, 1970

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed









# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of April 21, 1970  
91st-2nd; No. 63

### CONTENTS

Adjourned.....8	Food labeling.....4	Reclamation.....2
Appropriations.....7	Forests.....1	Recreation.....2
Claims.....7	Loans.....5	Reorganization.....12
Conservation.....11	Meat inspection.....10	Sugar.....5
Dairy products.....15	Personnel.....12	Wilderness.....1
Environment.....6,13	Pollution.....6,13	Wild rivers.....14
Family assistance.....9	Properties.....2	Youth conservation.....3

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee denied rule on Youth Conservation Corps bill.  
Senate committee voted to report bill to extend Toiyabe Forest boundaries.

### SENATE

1. FORESTS; WILDERNESS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3279, to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest in Nev., and S. 3222, to designate as wilderness land in Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, Okla. p. D379
2. RECLAMATION; RECREATION; PROPERTIES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 434, the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin; S. 2253, funds for increasing acquisition of lands for Cape Cod National Seashore; and H. R. 14896, to establish a program to preserve additional national historic properties. p. D379

HOUSE

3. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. The Rules Committee denied a rule on H. R. 15361, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. p. D382
4. FOOD LABELING. Rep. Farbstein inserted an editorial endorsing his proposed bill to require the open dating of packaged foods. p. H3337
5. SUGAR; LOANS. Rep. Hall inserted an editorial "condemning the financial nightmare" the EDA and SBA "have foisted on the taxpayers of this Nation by their bankrolling of Maine Sugar Industries, Inc." pp. H7339-40
6. ENVIRONMENT; POLLUTION. Several Representatives announced that today, April 22, is Earth Day and discussed provisions of various bills they have introduced on environmental pollution. pp. H3336-7, H3337-8, H3340-52, H3364-5
7. CLAIMS. Received from the President a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States (H. Doc. 91-315); to Appropriations Committee. p. H3365
8. ADJOURNED until Thursday, April 23. p. H3365

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

9. FAMILY ASSISTANCE. Speech in the House by Rep. Reid, Ill., expressing, with certain reservations, her support for the proposed Family Assistance Act. pp. E3433-4
10. MEAT INSPECTION. Rep. Gubser said that "it has been reliably reported to me" that the Dept. of Agriculture is considering the issuance of a regulation which would allow certain retailers to do business with restaurants, etc. without being required to comply with the Wholesome Meat Act. pp. E3455-6
11. CONSERVATION. Rep. Brademas inserted several prize-winning speeches on soil and water conservation districts. pp. E3472-4

BILLS INTRODUCED

12. PERSONNEL. H. R. 17135, by Rep. Helstoski, to amend title 5, U.S.C., to require heads of the respective executive agencies to provide the Congress with advance notice of certain planned organizational and other changes or actions which would affect Federal civilian employment; to Civil Service Committee.
13. ENVIRONMENT; POLLUTION. H. R. 17132, by Rep. Fish, to establish a national system of solid waste management; to Ways and Means Committee.
14. WILD RIVERS. H. R. 17126, by Rep. Blatnik, to designate the Kettle River, in the State of Minn., as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system; and H. R. 17130, by Rep. Cohelan, to amend the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 to include the Eel, Klamath and Trinity Rivers as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

15. DAIRY PRODUCTS. S. 2595, provides use of certain surplus dairy products for school lunch program. Approved April 17, 1970 (Public Law 91-233).



**Quorum Calls—Record Votes:** No quorum calls or record votes developed during the proceedings of the House today.

**Program for Thursday, April 23:** Met at noon and adjourned at 2:45 p.m. until noon on Thursday, April 23, when the House will consider H.R. 16516, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for fiscal year 1971 (open rule, 2 hours of debate); and H.R. 14385, to provide authority for subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees to Rockville, Md. (open rule, 1 hour of debate).

## Committee Meetings

### GENERAL FARM BILL

*Committee on Agriculture:* Met in executive session for continued consideration of general farm bill.

Committee to continue Thursday, April 23.

### METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION

*Committee on the District of Columbia:* Subcommittee No. 4 met in executive session and heard testimony from George A. Avery, chairman, Metropolitan Area Transit Commission. No announcements were made.

### MANPOWER ACT

*Committee on Education:* Select Subcommittee on Labor resumed hearings on H.R. 10908, H.R. 11620, and H.R. 13472, the proposed manpower bills. Witnesses heard were George McGhee, Urban Coalition Action Council; Robert M. Jones, Detroit, NAM; Austin E. Kirby, national economic director, American Legion; and William E. Naumann, chairman, Legislative Committee, Associated General Contractors.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

### ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY EDUCATION ACT

*Committee on Education and Labor:* Select Subcommittee on Education continued hearings on H.R. 14753, the Environmental Quality Education Act. Testimony was heard from Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education; Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education; John Osman, staff director, urban policy conference program, Brookings Institute; and Jefferson B. Fordham, president, Association of American Law Schools; dean, University of Pennsylvania Law School.

### PRIVATE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS

*Committee on Education and Labor:* General Subcommittee on Labor continued hearings on H.R. 1045, H.R. 1046, and H.R. 16462, private welfare and pension plans. Witnesses heard were E. S. Willis, manager, employee benefits, General Electric Co., and George W. Apperson, president, Local 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, Washington, D.C.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

### IMPACT AID REFORM ACT

*Committee on Education and Labor:* General Subcommittee on Education continued hearings on H.R. 16307 and H.R. 16384, the Impact Aid Reform Act of 1970. Testimony was heard from Dr. George Balling, assistant superintendent, State and Federal relations, Chicago Board of Education; Carl Stenmark, Denver Public Schools; Mario Nascati, deputy director of finance and Gerald Moeller, Division of Education and Research, St. Louis Board of Education.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

### UNITED NATIONS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

*Committee on Foreign Affairs:* Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements resumed hearings on the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. Testimony was heard from Representative Bingham.

### EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT

*Committee on Internal Security:* Continued hearings on repeal of the Emergency Detention Act. Witnesses heard were Representative Button; Robert J. Goddard and Russell E. White, Electronic Industries Association; Ross Wilbur, American Friends Service Committee; Herbert Philbrick, author; and James R. Willis, Esq., Cleveland, Ohio.

### PUBLIC BROADCASTING CORPORATION EXTENSION

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:* Subcommittee on Communications and Power met in executive session for consideration of H.R. 16338 and H.R. 16500, Public Broadcasting Corporation extension. No announcements were made.

### MUTUAL FUNDS

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:* Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance met in executive session for continued consideration of H.R. 14737, mutual funds.

Subcommittee to continue tomorrow.

### CLEAN AIR ACT

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:* Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare met in executive session for continued consideration of H.R. 15848 and related bills, Clean Air Act amendments; and H.R. 11701 and related bills, drug abuse.

Subcommittee to continue tomorrow.

### JUDICIARY MISCELLANY

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House the following bills:

S. 1508 amended, permits the retirement of judges and justices of the United States at full annuity at any age after serving at least 20 years continuously or otherwise;



H.R. 10019 amended, establishes a Commission on Marihuana to be composed of nine members appointed by the President;

H.R. 6951, Interstate Agreement on Detainers Act.

Also, the Committee on the Judiciary appointed a special subcommittee of five of its members to consider House Resolution 920 calling for the impeachment of Associate Justice William O. Douglas of high crimes and misdemeanors and misbehavior in office.

#### POSTAL RATES

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:* Subcommittee on Postal Rates continued hearings and heard testimony from Hon. Winton M. Blount, Postmaster General; Hon. James W. Hargrove, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Finance and Administration, and other postal officials.

#### HIGHWAY MATTERS

*Committee on Public Works:* Subcommittee on Roads began hearings on legislation dealing with highway matters. Witnesses heard were Representatives Ryan, Reid of New York, and Gude; Robert Block, chairman, Rochester Genesee Area Regional Transportation Authority, Rochester, N.Y.

Hearings continue Thursday, April 23.

#### COMMITTEE BUSINESS

*Committee on Public Works:* Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds met in executive session on pending matters. No announcements were made.

Subcommittee to continue Thursday, April 23.

#### ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

*Committee on Rules:* Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of, and 1 hour of debate, making in order consideration of S. 3544, on H.R. 16200, Arms Control and Disarmament Act, 1970. Testimony was heard from Chairman Morgan.

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS ACT

*Committee on Rules:* Denied a rule on H.R. 15361, Youth Conservation Corps Act. Testimony was heard from Chairman Perkins and Representatives Daniels and Meeds.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

*Committee on Rules:* Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of, and 1 hour of debate, making in order consideration of S. 2452, on H.R. 10138, provides, under the Public Health Service Act, for the equalization of retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Public Health Service with those provided for other officers in the uniformed services. Testimony was heard from Chairman Staggers and Representative Springer.

#### OBSCENE MAIL MATTER

*Committee on Rules:* Granted an open rule providing for the consideration of, and 2 hours of debate, on H.R. 15693, protection of minors and of right of privacy from sexually oriented mail. Testimony was heard from Representative Henderson.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

*Committee on Rules:* Ordered reported to the House H. Res. 930, providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8298) to eliminate certain restrictions under the Interstate Commerce Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Staggers, Springer, and Nelsen.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Met in executive session for continued consideration of social security amendments.

Committee to continue tomorrow.

### Joint Committee Meetings

#### AIRPORTS AND AIRWAYS

*Conferees,* in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 14465, providing Federal assistance for expansion of the Nation's airports and airways, and to amend the laws relative to the taxation of aviation facilities.

#### D.C. CRIME

*Conferees* resumed, in executive session, to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of S. 2601, omnibus D.C. crime bill, but did not reach final agreement and will meet again on Thursday, April 23.

#### BILLS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

##### New Laws

(For last listing of public laws, see DIGEST, p. D360, April 15, 1970)

H.R. 16612, providing additional funds for the D.C. Bail Agency for fiscal year 1970. Signed April 15, 1970 (P.L. 91-232).

S. 2595, to give nonprofit school lunch programs priority in the use of certain surplus dairy products. Signed April 17, 1970 (P.L. 91-233).

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

##### Senate

*Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,* executive, to mark up S. 3374, authorizing funds for NASA for fiscal year 1971, 2:30 p.m., 235 Old Senate Office Building.









# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 4, 1970  
91st-2nd; No. 91

### CONTENTS

Agricultural Appropriations...	3	Food Stamps.....	25	Pollution.....	15
Appropriations.....	3,6	Foreign Trade.....	20	Prices.....	17
Budget.....	13	Inflation.....	25	River Basins.....	6
Conservation.....	2,5	Loans.....	4,8	Slaughtering.....	1
Committee.....	18	Meat Inspection.....	1,12	Solid Waste.....	4
Economic Data.....	17	Mink Imports.....	21	Taxation.....	19,22
Economy.....	7	Mink Skins.....	20	Tobacco.....	26
Employment.....	10	Opinion Poll.....	14	Wildlife.....	16
Environment.....	2,15,18	Personnel.....	10,23		

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported agricultural appropriation bill. Senate committee reported custom livestock slaughtering bill. Rep. Findley urged setting of wheat referendum date. Rep. Kluczynski inserted USDA's letter on allegations of inadequate imported meat inspection. Rep. Mahon inserted "'budget score-keeping'" report.

### SENATE

1. MEAT INSPECTION; SLAUGHTERING. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported with amendment S. 3592 to clarify the provisions relating to custom slaughtering operations (Rept. No. 91-915). p. S8347
2. CONSERVATION; ENVIRONMENT. Sen. McGee stated that he favors a fresh approach to environmental discussion, dropping the verbiage in vogue in preference for the practical approach of Wyoming writer Mike Leon. p. S8377-78

HOUSE

3. APPROPRIATIONS. The Agriculture Committee reported H. R. 17923, the agricultural appropriations bill for FY 71 (H. Rept. No. 91-1161). (A copy of the report will be attached to the next Digest.) p. H5183  
Passed with amendment H. R. 17867, making appropriations for Foreign Assistance for FY 71. pp. H5101-45  
Passed without amendment H. R. 17868, the D.C. appropriations bill for FY 71. pp. H5089-100  
During the debate on the Foreign Assistance appropriation bill, Rep. Mahon discussed the importance of the agricultural appropriation bill and the ways that it touches the lives of all Americans. pp. H5108-9
4. SOLID WASTE; LOANS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported, with amendment, H. R. 11833, amending the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities (H. Rept. No. 91-1155). p. H5182
5. CONSERVATION. The Rules Committee granted a rule for the consideration of H. R. 15361, establishing the Youth Conservation Corps pilot program. p. H5182
6. RIVER BASINS. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 15166, authorizing additional appropriations for flood control projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans. This bill now goes to the President. pp. H5145-48
7. ECONOMY. Rep. Patman urged the President to roll back interest rates and inserted a copy of P. L. 91-151, a copy of his letter to the President requesting a meeting, and a radio interview on current economic trends. pp. H5151-56
8. LOANS. Rep. Roth discussed the current issue of "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance" and urged the passage of H. R. 17112, the proposed Program Information Act. pp. H5167-8
9. ENVIRONMENT. Rep. Saylor commended Field and Stream on its 75th anniversary and inserted several articles from its anniversary issue on the future of man's environment. pp. H5172-7



like to take this opportunity to reaffirm my own views concerning the situation in Southeast Asia for their benefit.

In Congress and in rallies and meetings across the Nation, Americans have argued all aspects of this matter. Many have expressed strong support for the President, but many others have expressed concern about whether he had constitutional authority to move into Cambodia; whether the action would involve expansion of the war; whether it would cause misunderstanding throughout the world; whether it involved needless risk of the lives of American soldiers; whether it would delay bringing American boys home from Vietnam.

President Nixon, in speaking to the Nation last night, has laid many fears to rest. When he took office last year, he inherited a full-scale war in which approximately 542,000 U.S. military personnel were already engaged. The "morality" or "legality" of the war was beside the point, since it already existed and he had to try to bring it to a conclusion without endangering American men fighting it or prisoners of it.

Already 112,000 Americans have been brought home, one out of every four who were there when he became Commander in Chief. He has done exactly what he said he would do within the timetables he has announced. To reasonable people this fact alone should be ample assurance that he will continue to do what he says.

Last night the President said our military objectives have been achieved in Cambodia, and that as a result of the gains made there 50,000 of the 150,000 men he had promised to bring home by spring will now be home by October 15.

This will mean that by spring force levels will fall below 280,000, almost a 50 percent cut from the high mark, and for all practical purposes we will have withdrawn our combat troops and the forces remaining will be primarily supply and logistics units. We will have disengaged and turned the fighting over to a well-trained, million-man South Vietnamese Army, and our noncombatants also can come home as this army develops its capability to handle the supply and logistics tasks. Anyone remotely familiar with military operations knows these things cannot be accomplished instantly.

All of us want out of this war as fast as possible, the President of the United States most of all. We have differed not about whether to get out, but about how to do it; about the minimum time required to do it without inviting costly consequences.

Those who say we should "cut and run to stop the killing" are silent about what would happen to 11 million South Vietnamese, at least half of whom would be liquidated by the North Vietnamese regime if they got their hands on them. Abandoning them a few short months before the South's capability is developed to prevent a bloodbath would, far from stopping the killing, facilitate it. To do so would make the United States a passive accessory to an act of genocide. And the fate to which it would relegate over 1,500 American prisoners of war is unthinkable.

The President has chosen the alternative of withdrawing in stages while building the South's ability to defend itself. The strategy was endangered when, immediately after his April 20 withdrawal announcement Hanoi ordered 40,000 troops in the sanctuaries to take over most of Cambodia, and particularly to reopen the Port of Sihanoukville through which 80 percent of its munitions used against the lower two-thirds of South Vietnam had reached the sanctuaries until the fall of Prince Sihanouk. Had Hanoi succeeded, an intolerable situation would have stretched for 600 miles along South Vietnam's western border. By our capture of vast amounts of Communist war material, we have prevented Hanoi's troops from carrying out their orders to kill no less than 100 Americans per week from the sanctuaries to keep the political pressure on Washington.

The President's move against the Cambodian sanctuaries was, despite assertions to the contrary, legal both under article 51 of the U.N. Covenant and under international law. Cambodia's inability to enforce its own neutrality gave injured parties the right to take action, and both the United States and South Vietnam did so and notified the United Nations. This right of action does not depend on a declaration of war, because war is a fact which may legally exist independently of a declaration, and when war exists, declared or undeclared, the rules of war apply. The only illegality in Cambodia is on the part of North Vietnam, which invaded a part of a neutral country and took it for its own use.

The so-called "end the war amendments" are being hailed by some as a means to make the war disappear. Actually they would use the withholding of money as a means to restrict how, when, and where the President can take action to get us out of the mess, and they are extremely dangerous in my opinion. Hamstringing the President cannot possibly speed the end of the fighting, and a lot of men in uniform might easily get killed waiting for Congress to repeal some unwise restrictions on something they might have to do immediately to protect themselves. We can only try to imagine how World War II might have ended if Congress had tried to make such military decisions for Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have all the answers, but I believe the President, who has more information available to him concerning this conflict than any other man, deserves our support in attempting to resolve it. I respect the right of those who disagree with me to their own outlook. If I am in error, I am prepared to change my mind, and I hope all others, regardless of their opinion at the moment would do likewise. The important thing here is ending this war and keeping out of others. Whether we agree or disagree with the way in which the President is attempting to end it, it is of the utmost importance that in any debate and dialog concerning the war we maintain decent respect for our country and its President. It is likewise essential that we never lose sight of the deep and grave

responsibility which rests with the Hanoi government for its perpetuation.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. SYMINGTON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for June 4, 1970, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following members (at the request of Mr. MYERS) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANDALL, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MELCHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PEPPER, for 60 minutes, on June 9.

Mr. WOLFF, for 60 minutes, on June 9.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, to extend his remarks following those of Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, to include tables and extraneous matter with his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 17868.

Mr. NATCHER, to revise and extend his remarks made in the Committee on the Whole today on H.R. 17868 and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. RODINO, to revise and extend his remarks in debate on H.R. 17867.

Mr. PERKINS, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WYLIE, to extend his remarks following those of Mr. GROSS during general debate today on H.R. 17687.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), to extend his remarks following those of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN during general debate today on H.R. 17867.

Mr. PASSMAN, during general debate today and to include extraneous matter and tabular material.

Mr. BUCHANAN, during debate on the foreign aid bill in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MYERS) are to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. PELLY.



## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 8, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2109. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of disbursements made against the appropriation for "Contingencies, Defense" during the period July 1, 1969–March 31, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2110. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract for the provision of facilities and services for the public within the portion of Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area lying within the State of Montana, for a term ending December 31, 1999, pursuant to the provisions of 67 Stat. 271, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2111. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Board for 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(g) of the Department of Transportation Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2112. A letter from the president, Communications Satellite Corp., transmitting the annual report of the corporation, pursuant to the provisions of section 404(b), title 4, of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2113. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2114. A letter from the executive vice president, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the annual audit of the association, for the year ended March 31, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of 64 Stat. 869; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4587. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Indians certain lands in Alpine County, Calif.; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 14984. A bill to provide

for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 142, 359–363, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15866. A bill to repeal the act of August 25, 1959, with respect to the final disposition of the affairs of the Choctaw Tribe; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 16416. A bill to reimburse the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for tribal funds that were used to construct, operate, and maintain the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 885. An act to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose lineal ancestors were members of the Confederated Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, merged under the treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Dockets No. 314, amended, 314-E and 65, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 887. An act to further extend the period of restrictions on lands of the Quapaw Indians, Okla., and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 91-1154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 11833. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1155). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 16327. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WATTS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10517. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to distilled spirits, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1063. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 15361, a bill to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-11582). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 914. Resolution providing for agreeing to the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 4249) to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to the discriminatory use of tests and devices (Rept. No. 91-1159). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 976. Resolution to authorize a select committee of the House to study firsthand the recent developments in Southeast Asia and then report its find-

Mr. MYERS in two instances.  
Mr. MORSE in two instances.  
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.  
Mr. LANGEN.  
Mr. NELSEN in three instances.  
Mr. SCHERLE.  
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
Mr. ROBISON in two instances.  
Mr. MICHEL.  
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.  
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. FINDLEY in three instances.  
Mr. HARSHA in two instances.  
Mr. WHALEN in three instances.  
Mr. LLOYD.  
Mr. BURTON of Utah.  
Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.  
Mr. BUTTON in two instances.  
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.  
Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.  
Mr. RUTH in two instances.  
Mr. HUNT.  
Mr. BOW.  
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.  
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MELCHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MAHON in two instances.  
Mr. SCHEUER in three instances.  
Mr. DENT in two instances.  
Mr. EILBERG.  
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.  
Mr. HULL.  
Mr. MONTGOMERY.  
Mr. FRASER in seven instances.  
Mr. KYROS.  
Mr. WALDIE in four instances.  
Mr. RYAN in six instances.  
Mr. DINGELL in three instances.  
Mr. GARMATZ.  
Mr. JACOBS.  
Mr. ANDERSON of California.  
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in two instances.  
Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.  
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.  
Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.  
Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.  
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.  
Mr. MCFALL in five instances.  
Mr. DONOHUE in two instances.  
Mr. DORN in three instances.  
Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.  
Mr. EDWARDS of California.  
Mr. BINGHAM.  
Mr. FALLON in two instances.  
Mr. NEDZI.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 12619. An act to amend section 11 of an act approved August 4, 1950 entitled "An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress."









# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 15, 1970  
91st-2nd; No. 98

### CONTENTS

Almonds.....1	Economy.....10	Marine Resources.....6
Apples.....1	Education.....3	Marketing Orders.....1
Appropriations.....20	Electrification.....11	Marketing Research.....1
Bald Eagle.....24	Environment.....4	Mosquitos.....26
CCC.....12	Farm Bill.....5,23	Personnel.....16
Conservation.....2,21	Fish.....13	Recreation.....15,22
Consumers.....14,19	Housing.....8	Revenue-Sharing.....17
Cultural Exchange.....3	Imports.....10	Textiles.....9
Dairy Programs.....12	Inflation.....10	Wilderness.....7
DDT.....25	Loans.....18	Wildlife.....13

HIGHLIGHTS: House subcommittee approved bills permitting marketing orders for apples and marketing research for almonds. House passed bill establishing Youth Conservation Corps. Rep. Mize urged action on farm bill.

### HOUSE

1. MARKETING ORDERS; MARKETING RESEARCH. An Agriculture Committee subcommittee approved for full committee action H. R. 9736 and S. 1456, permitting marketing orders applicable to apples for paid advertising; H. R. 9737 and S. 1455, including Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois and Ohio among states to participate in marketing agreement and order programs with respect to apples; and H. R. 13978, amended, authorizing marketing research and promotion projects for almonds. p. D628
2. CONSERVATION. Passed with amendments S. 1076, establishing the Youth Conservation Corps pilot program. pp. H5525-46

3. EDUCATION; CULTURAL EXCHANGE. Received from the President the annual report on the international educational and cultural exchange program. pp. H5500-1
4. ENVIRONMENT. Passed over H. Res. 562 relative to participation in the 1972 UN Conference on Human Environment. p. H5501
5. FARM BILL. Rep. Mize discussed the effect of present farm programs on feed grain farmers and urged action on the farm bill. p. H5564
6. MARINE RESOURCES. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported H. R. 11766, amending title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (H. Rept. No. 91-1192). p. H5569

#### SENATE

7. WILDERNESS. Passed without amendment S. 1732 to designate as wilderness certain lands in the Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho. p. S8975
8. HOUSING. Sen. Sparkman stated that the Senate had not been guilty of foot dragging on housing legislation, noting that by a 72-0 roll call vote in late March passage was achieved of package "emergency legislation". p. S8988
9. IMPORTS; TEXTILES. Sen. Javits reviewed the current textile import controversy with Japan, suggesting that a compromise solution be reached. pp. S8991-93
10. ECONOMY. Sen. Jordan told the Idaho Republican State Convention that "the depletion of our resources by excessive and wasteful military spending is a central element of inflation".
11. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Harris praised the success of REA in Oklahoma and inserted a student essay on the improved quality of rural life due to REA. p. S8997

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

12. CCC; DAIRY PROGRAMS. S. 3961, by Sen. Dole; to make permanent the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer dairy products to military and veterans hospitals, and to make permanent the dairy farmer indemnity payment program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Remarks of author p. S8978
13. FISH; WILDLIFE. S. 3962, by Sen. Metcalf; to revise and clarify the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act; to the Committee on Commerce.
14. CONSUMERS. S. 3965; by Sen. Gore; to provide for the establishment of a National Consumers Advisory Board, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Remarks of author pp. S8981-5
15. RECREATION. S. 3966, by Sen. Case; to prohibit the use of certain park and recreational lands for public work projects unless such land so utilized are replaced by lands of a like kind; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.



dren, or parents of such veteran under any such policy is equal to or exceeds the face value of the policy and such amount paid when added to any amounts paid as death compensation is equal to or less than the total amount which would have been payable in dependency and indemnity compensation following the death of such veteran if such widow, children, or parents had been eligible for such compensation upon the death of such veteran. Any person receiving death compensation at the time he becomes eligible for dependency and indemnity compensation pursuant to clause (2) of the preceding sentence shall continue to receive such death compensation unless he makes application to the Administrator to be paid dependency and indemnity compensation. An election by such person to receive dependency and indemnity compensation shall be final.

"(b) The last sentence of section 417(a) of such title is amended by striking out 'preceding sentence' and inserting in lieu thereof 'first sentence'.

"(c) No dependency and indemnity compensation shall be payable to any person by virtue of the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section for any person prior to the effective date of this Act."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in considering this bill S. 1479, which has as its primary purpose the increasing of the amount of insurance for men on active duty from \$10,000 to \$15,000, the House adopted a complete substitute for the Senate bill with certain liberalizations.

The Senate has now accepted 99 percent of the House amendments but has changed in two instances the provisions of the bill as passed by the House, one of which is to provide a slightly altered definition of certain terms—widow, widower, child, and parent—and a provision making certain widows eligible for dependency and indemnity compensation in some instances where the husband had maintained a national service life insurance policy for a limited time on a premium-free basis.

Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons I would have preferred the House language, but because of other matters in this program which are urgent I am moving to concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments to the House amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the veterans' bills considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION OF AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JUNE 15, 1970.

Hon. JOHN McCORMACK,  
The Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter is written to notify you that I am resigning as a Conferee on H.R. 14685, the International Travel Act.

Thanking you in advance for removing my name from the above, I am,

Respectfully yours,

GLENN CUNNINGHAM,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS KEITH, as a conferee to replace the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT UNTIL MIDNIGHT WEDNESDAY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Wednesday to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS ACT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1063 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1063

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15361) to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 15361, the Committee on Education and Labor shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1076, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 15361 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr.

LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1063 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of House Resolution 15361, the Youth Conservation Corps Act. The resolution also provides that, after passage of the House bill, the Committee on Education and Labor shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 1076 and it shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and amend it with the House-passed language.

The purpose of H.R. 15361 is to establish the Youth Conservation Corps which would be a 3-year pilot program employing roughly 3,000 young people ages 14 to 18 each year during the summer on public lands.

There are 4.8 million acres of national forest land needing replanting. Each year, more than 14 billion board feet of public timber are lost to fire, insects, and disease. Recreational use of the public lands is skyrocketing. National park visitations are expected to double between 1968 and the early 1970's and could increase 10 times by the year 2000. Trails, campsites, roads, picnic grounds, watersheds, fish stocking—all must be increased and maintained.

In June of last year, unemployment among youths ages 14 to 18 was 16.4 percent and neglect of a budgetary nature frustrates Federal land management. In Olympic National Park are 600 miles of trails that the staff has never been able to open completely or maintain.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$3.5 million annually for 3 years following enactment of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1063.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the House, I would just like to make a brief statement and then ask a couple of questions.

Mr. Speaker, the brief observation is that I am very much in accord with the objectives of this bill; namely, conservation both of the natural resources and of the youth of this country. But, Mr. Speaker, this bill is not all gold, although it may glitter. The objective is worthy, but with all of the trouble in the land among our youth, to select a group of youngsters from the tender age of 14 to 19 from all sections of the country and to concentrate them in these camps of both races and, more important still, of both sexes is going to pose a very serious situation. I do not want to raise any question of race here. Even if I did, I would have too much discretion to do so, because I know where the votes would be. But I am saying—and I hope that those who are not listening will at least read the bill so that they will know what they are doing—to select young girls of 14 years of age up to 19 years of age and send them in to this type of a camp



under the conditions that exist in the country today I think would be most unwise.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Rules was very much disturbed about this bill. It was held up there for a number of weeks, if not months. It killed the bill on one occasion and then reported it again on a motion to reconsider by a still divided vote.

I think it is a grave mistake to take young people and particularly young girls of 14 years of age and concentrate them in these camps, regardless of the objective. I feel it is a grave mistake when you consider the fact that you have opposite sexes—I assume that there will be separate dormitories or barracks for them; I certainly hope so—but there is nothing in the bill here that would indicate that to be the fact.

So, Mr. Speaker, as one who opposed the bill in committee, I wanted to raise my voice against it here on the floor of the House.

Now, if the chief author of the bill, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), or some of the cosponsors would care to answer the question as to whether they would be willing to accept an amendment when we get into the Committee of the Whole or either omit the young girls entirely from this thing and make it a male proposition, I would be inclined to go along with it. However, I still think that the age of 14 years is too young. Let me impress if I can upon my friend, Mr. MEEDS, that this is not the old CCC camp operation in any manner. This is an entirely new project with a worthy objective, I agree, but a mistake to administer it in this way.

If the gentleman cares to comment on that I hope my friend from California will yield to him, or if he wants to comment upon it during general debate, I hope he will do so.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, if I can just make a brief comment and then I certainly shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) to make a further comment, it is my understanding that certain amendments will be offered to this legislation. I, personally, am committed to support such amendments, because as I stated a moment ago in my appraisal and estimation this bill is a conservation measure. It is not necessarily that way as it is now written. I would oppose the bill as it is presently written. I expect to support amendments to the bill which will make of it a conservation measure not only for the people involved but also for the benefit of our national resources.

With reference to the further comment, we are taking out of the bill—at least I would hope if the amendments are adopted—certain agencies that some of us may have some concern about. If amendments are adopted, as I hope they will be, this program will be administered by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

Again, with reference to the ages and the matter of sexes I feel certain—and, now, I am going on the basis of some experimental programs that we now have going in California to some extent I might say on which this program has

been patterned where we have no problem with the mixing of the sexes—of girls or boys—and we have not had any problem with reference to the youth. That is why, as I say, basically, the manner in which the program is being operated as a form of a local program in California at the present time is very closely akin to the old Civilian Conservation Corps program of many years ago to which I am sure my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), was referring.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that I want to see some amendments to this bill. It is my understanding that the authors have agreed to accept some amendments and I expect to support them. In fact, I would hope that once we amend this bill in the proper form that my good and able friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, gentleman from Mississippi, will be in a position to support it. I think that the authors of the bill are for generally the same thing.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further to me before he yields to the gentleman from Washington, I think the gentleman from California, my friend (Mr. SISK), is most forthright on most occasions but I am afraid a little evasive on this one.

Mr. SISK. I had no intention to be, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman failed to reply to me on the question I raised on concentrating these children of tender age of both sexes in the same camp.

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will allow me just a comment, of course, my answer to that aspect was my confidence in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, based on their past record.

Now, this, as I said in the beginning, is not in my opinion and must not be a so-called manpower training program, or anything of that kind. To the extent that prohibitions could be written into the bill I certainly personally would have no objection to them, but I think this might be a matter for the authors of the bill to consider.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), to make comments in connection with this problem.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman correctly states the situation with regard to the amendment that he has discussed. However, I have heard of no amendment which would either strike the young ladies from this bill, or would place impediments upon the administering agencies to require them to be in separate camps.

They may well do this—I do not know. But I think one of the great problems we could run into in this legislation is attempting to define very strictly the way this program should be operated. We have properly left some discretion with the departments because this is a pilot program, and we expect them to try different types of programs so that we can get the kind of program eventually

that this Nation should adopt, and utilize for conservation of our great natural resources.

I would just point out to the able gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) that not only are young men from ages 14 to 18 in this Nation in turmoil and unrest, and not only are they energetic and desirous of working with our natural resources, but the young ladies in this age group are also willing and determined and aggressive for work in outdoor projects.

We have in the State of Washington a private program which is run by the Olympic National Park and the Seattle School Districts, which is proceeding with the program in which there are young ladies involved in conservation work, and they are doing a very fine job. They are working. They are contributing to our ecology, and to the betterment of our conservation projects daily in the summer in Olympic National Park. They have had no accidents, they are out doing a good, hard day's work, and they enjoy it. They as a matter of fact recount it as one of the most valuable experiences they have had.

So I would hope this House would not take upon itself to make conditions as to the type of programs which should be tried within the context of this pilot program. If we find out that it does not work then I would assure the gentleman from Mississippi that I would be the first one to be opposed to it, but I do not think we should prejudge it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) a question, if I may.

I believe the gentleman from Washington made a remark in his comments a short time ago that there would be various kinds of programs within a 90-day limit. It is difficult for me to comprehend how you could have various pilot programs in a 90-day limit, which is only 3 months, by the time you would hire your supervisory personnel—and who they would be, I do not know.

I think the most astonishing thing about this entire bill is that nobody wants to administer it.

I have three letters—one from the Department of Labor—they do not want it. One from the Department of Agriculture—they do not want it. One from the Department of the Interior—and they do not want it.

Furthermore, this is an unbudgeted item. I think when you are talking about 14- to 18-year-olds, we are in a situation here where we are going to have nothing more than a glorified baby-sitting project. I think at this time this program is being well implemented under an existing program in the Department of Labor through the Park Service. I would certainly hope that this House would take



another look at this bill that involves \$3.5 million, and vote it down.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEDS. I hope the gentleman will correct the record. He said \$3.5 billion. He should have said \$3.5 million.

Mr. SCHERLE. That is what I said.

Mr. MEEDS. That is a little different. Mr. SCHERLE. I said \$3.5 million.

Mr. MEEDS. I will just try to respond to one of the issues at this time that the gentleman raised when he said we would not have time to try different programs within this pilot program.

First of all, let me point out to the gentleman that this envisions a 3-year bill—three summer trials, and I think a number of different programs could be tried during that time. Also, different kinds of programs could take place at different locations in the country. This is a national program and we certainly would not be tied to any one set kind of program all over the United States.

As a matter of fact, I hope they try different ones.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize a Youth Conservation Corps to employ young people, during the summer, on the public lands.

The program is authorized for 3 years. It expects to employ about 3,000 young people each summer, ranging in age from 14 to 18. They will do conservation work in the national forests, on replanting projects, and in parks, on maintenance of trails, campsites and picnic grounds.

Employment will be for a period of up to 90 days in the summer. Income factors will not be weighed in choosing corpsmen for the program. The program will be under the direction of a newly created Inter-Agency Committee composed of representatives of the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, and Labor. Authorizations are for \$3,500,000 annually for 3 years. At the time this bill was before the Rules Committee it was decided that this program could be improved by limiting its scope to the Interior and Agriculture Departments. The chairman of Labor and Education Committee (Mr. PERKINS), and the bill's chief sponsor (Mr. MEEDS), both agreed to accept such an amendment. I am prepared to offer such an amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Minority views are filed by five members. They oppose enactment because:

First, the project will be another "category" grant program, not coordinated with other manpower and training programs;

Second, it would teach no skills to the enrollees, who would be employed for no more than 90 days each summer; and

Third, it does not provide preference for those who need assistance most—the poor.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time during the consideration of the rule to ask a question because there seems to be a conflict in the bill itself and the report.

Referring to page 3, section 3(b)(2) the bill reads as follows:

(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

Referring to the committee report on page 5 in the section-by-section analysis of the bill, in analyzing section 3(b)(2) the report says:

(2) Determine the rates of pay, hours and other conditions of employment. Corps members are not deemed Federal employees for purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

That provision seems to me to be a direct conflict. I would like somebody to explain what has happened here. The bill is not at all consistent with the explanatory analysis section by section.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The provision to which the gentleman refers has been carried in similar legislation since the days of the committee's original consideration of legislation to establish a conservation corps.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Does the gentleman mean it has been in conflict all this time and that I have just now caught it?

Mr. PERKINS. No, there is no conflict in the bill.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Read the language. It states:

They shall not be deemed to be Federal employees other than for purposes of Chapter 171 of Title 28, United States Code, and Chapter 81, of Title 5, United States Code.

And the explanation states:

Corps members are not deemed Federal employees for the purpose of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

But the bill itself states they will not be considered Federal employees except for the purposes of the Tort Claims Act.

Mr. PERKINS. I shall apologize to the gentleman and say there is a discrepancy. The report is in error, not the bill.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman. I yield back to the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I personally introduced a conservation corps bill that was sent to the committee along the lines of this bill except that it did speak primarily to young men. It was directed in terms of an age span a little higher than this bill, and it was particularly directed toward forest conservation and forest management. However, I am in full sympathy with the desires of the committee to go on a pilot program and to determine at this point in time what it is that we really need. I can understand their being concerned about high school students and the desire to bring productive employment as early as possible to those who may not be completing high school work. I note that this is going to be only a summer program, and I am rather dis-

appointed in that, because I would like to have seen a program that would be extended over the entire year. But again, we did learn when we went into the massive programs projected by the last administration that it is best to try pilot programs first and find out what you are doing.

I think the best thing this report provides is shown on page 4 beginning at line 16, where it states:

The Inter-Agency Committee must also prepare a report describing how best to initiate a State-local-Federal cost-sharing program for a Youth Conservation Corps that would work on State and municipal lands.

It is my view that what this Federal Government should start to do more in earnest is to work out programs by which States can take over more responsibility for some of these domestic programs, so we can have diversification in order to meet the needs of the States. We should encourage the States to make commitments of its own resources in this kind of program so important to the total Nation.

I hope that this part of the bill will get significant attention and will take on real meaning, because I think if we will do that, and we can get the State governments where they are giving assistance, with the guidance of the Federal Government, sharing the responsibility with the Federal Government, we are going to have some programs that will begin to answer some of the problems across the Nation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WHITE. Would it not be wise if we would allow the age limit for employable persons in the summertime in private industry to go down to 14? I favor this particular bill, but it seems to me that private industry throughout the United States could also help to take young people off the streets if they were able to employ them at that age.

Mr. HANNA. In the State of California conditions have been brought to my attention showing that we do need to have some meshing of our employment policies. The real problems exist in the cities, and we do know that it would be better if young high school dropouts had some kind of employment. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this bill at this time, but several questions have been raised.

A question has been raised about the age at 14. I think I agree with the response to the last question. I think in terms of the entire Nation there ought to be a review and a study of the child labor laws we have, and I think there ought to be a review and a study of the compulsory education laws we have. I think we are doing a great disservice to the young people of this country to say they must remain in school although, while they are physically there, intellectually and in every other way they have dropped out, and yet to say at the same time they cannot work.



course, 3 months in the summer months, what are administrative costs going to be? Has anyone look into that?

In addition to that, when these youngsters arrive at these camps they have to be fed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

We talk about food and clothing, and subsistence. How long will it take to provide the necessary type of clothing? Are they going to wear uniforms, or are they going to bring their clothing with them from home?

Ladies and gentlemen, when they talk about a pilot program they are talking about a real pilot program, because nothing up until this date has been started, nor has it been considered.

I would ask that if the proponents of this legislation are really sincere in their efforts that they contact the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior, and ask them to go along with some type of a program from the State legislatures in their own individual States, to set up some kind of legislation that would permit this on a State level. But I do not think the taxpayers of this country at this time should be asked to finance this type of a baby-sitting project, not simply because it is a pilot project, but simply because it will not and cannot work.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. As I understand the report and the bill, this is going to be for children of all social and economic backgrounds. Does that mean that the taxpayers are going to have to pay for sending children of very wealthy people or upper middle class people to these camps with no part of the expense being paid by well-to-do parents?

Mr. SCHERLE. My colleague has brought up a very pertinent part of this bill and one that is perhaps the guts of the whole thing—yes, your assumption is correct.

Mr. MAYNE. How much more expensive is that going to make the bill than it would be if it were to be limited to needy youngsters?

Mr. SCHERLE. Let me give you an example.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps at the present time can take a youngster, and has taken youngsters, for less than \$500 a year and have equipped themselves to do much more than can be offered under this program. This program here at a minimum will exceed \$1,200 and this is according to figures of the Department of Labor and I think also by the proponents of the bill.

If this bill were to serve its purpose, I will say in answer to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE), then it should be directed toward disadvantaged youngsters and not to those of our affluent society who can well afford to provide means of recreation—and that is what this will be—it will not be a work program as much as it will be a baby sitting and recreation program.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, first let me congratulate most warmly the sponsor of the bill now before the House. Our distinguished colleague from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) has offered a bill which provides a very modest yet basic investment in America's future. I consider it an investment we cannot afford not to make. I am one of those who knew firsthand of the work of the old Civilian Conservation Corps in the early 1930's. I saw the great benefits which it provided in conservation—conservation of human values and human resources as well as of natural resources. The lessons which came from the Civilian Conservation Corps were extremely important at a time when our Nation badly needed direction, courage, and goals. Two camps were established very early in the program in my home county in Florida in what was then the Choctawhatchee National Forest. From those camps emerged some of the strong young leaders of that area in the years which followed.

Many years have elapsed and great strides have been made in many areas, yet many of the same problems which plagued us then still exist, and some are even more aggravated now than they were then. We are much more conscious of the environment now than we were in the early 1930's and if for no other reason, the Corps members will contribute most helpfully to the huge backlog of conservation work on public lands and recreation areas. As a part of their total summer activities, they will build and maintain camp and picnic areas, build hiking trails, plant trees, et cetera. The advantage of these activities should be very obvious.

But there are even more important advantages. For instance, the program would provide young people an opportunity for a productive, wholesome summer. There probably is no greater need for young people today than that they be gainfully occupied. Too many of them, whether affluent or disadvantaged, have nothing to do but hang around street corners and seek new thrills for release from boredom or frustration.

One of the most important advantages that I see is that the Corps' conservation work-education program will inject into the minds and spirits of tomorrow's citizens a sound and meaningful environmental ethic. Some of us know that nothing teaches the necessity of wise conservation better than practicing it. Youths would be trained, shown, and then actually participate in implementation of current principles and methods of conservation. In the process, they would absorb a deeper appreciation of the necessity of wisely managing our natural environment. An environmental ethic—what a meaningful thing for this generation to pass to the next.

There is another advantage which certainly cannot be overlooked in the area

of troubled relationships between youngsters of different social, economic, and ethnic backgrounds. The Youth Conservation Corps can help to bridge the gap between them. Under the organized supervision of experienced educators and conservationists, young people would learn to get along together, to communicate, to gain new lasting understandings. A human and outdoor living environment provides a unique resource of easing some of today's social problems. At summer's end, the youths would return to their homes with new friendships, new insights, and perhaps in some future time, new and workable answers to old and destructive problems.

Existing Federal youth programs are not similar to that proposed in H.R. 15361. Youth programs which provide job opportunities aim at increasing youth employability and otherwise relieving the conditions of poverty. These are very worthwhile goals, but are not the prime purposes of the Corps.

Two programs most similar to the Corps are Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps. Both include only disadvantaged, out-of-work and usually out-of-school youth. The Youth Conservation Corps includes youth from all economic backgrounds and would primarily include in-school youth.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is not a residential program nor does it aim at providing youth the opportunity to understand and appreciate the Nation's natural environment. Furthermore, Department of Labor policy has not encouraged such involvement. In 1969, around 364,000 youth were enrolled in New York City; about 600 were involved in conservation agency work. Most New York City slots have been programed to large urban areas.

The Job Corps civilian conservation centers program is a residential living program where youth, as a part of their training, conduct conservation work on Federal lands. This program, however, has and is being modified. Of the original 88 federally operated centers, 30 are currently operating. Conservation work is being deemphasized. The recent USDL redirection of Job Corps states:

It is necessary to . . . deemphasize the work program to the maximum extent possible.

In addition, the President's Manpower Training Act of 1969 (proposed), would further modify conservation activities in Job Corps.

I think it is clear that the proposed program does not overlap existing Federal programs and certainly there are none which, in my opinion, can be more effective for the objectives which are set forth. The Youth Conservation Corps is not primarily a manpower training program. It is not intended as such.

Yet, opponents have stated:

It would establish another categorical manpower program and that it does not provide the manpower services necessary for skill development.

The bill may not provide all manpower services necessary for skill development. This bill clearly states:

Employment of American youth in public lands creates an opportunity for understand-



ing and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage.

Employment, as envisioned in this bill, is a meaningful way to involve, acquaint, and commit youth to wise management of our natural environment. While the youth learn, they are productively contributing to the improvement and maintenance of natural resources on public lands and are being properly compensated. In addition, they would gain some work experience.

There are areas in the bill which should be improved, but this I believe can be accomplished during debate.

Again this is a modest program but one which is patterned on a most successful earlier program. The objectives are sound; the thinking back of the program is good. It can contribute significantly to America. It is worth all the cost and all the effort. I support it strongly.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS).

(Mr. COLLINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I had an opportunity to sit in on the committee hearings, and I can state that the bill was very ably presented. I wish everyone could have had the opportunity of hearing about the real challenge youngsters would have if they could go to the mountains of Washington or Oregon. I have never been there myself, but when we heard about these great mountains and what the outdoors would do for the youth, one could visualize everything that could be done through this particular bill.

But while we analyze it, I would like to call your attention to two or three things. First, at most, all we are talking about are 3,000 youngsters. In other words, we are talking about a plan to take care of 3,000 youngsters, although we have millions and millions of teenagers who would like to participate. This bill applies only to 3,000. So we really are not going to be able to accomplish much.

Ask yourselves this question: How would they find 10 boys or girls from Corpus Christi? How would they select another 25 out of Little Rock, or another 30 from Waterloo, Iowa, and so on down the line? How do you pick 3,000?

The other point is in relation to the length of the program. It is only a 90-day program, the hardest program in the world to administer.

This gets back to one of the two big problems we have in connection with it. We are creating a new bureaucracy. We are creating a new commission. If this thing was really needed, if we needed a program of this type, it could be handled through the National Park Service.

The one thing we do not need in Washington today is more and more bureaus. We need more and more consolidation and savings of administrative costs. The other thing we need to evaluate is what do we accomplish in America if we go to Atlanta, Ga., and pick up 10 youngsters and take them up to the State of Oregon and let them spend 90 days in this camp? What do we

accomplish? All we do is stir up unrest among the other 3,000 youngsters who do not get to go. When we help the 10, we are stirring up dissatisfaction among the others.

The program of the CCC was brought into this. Many of us are strong believers in what the CCC accomplished. We ought to compare it in its true light. It was a program for men. It could also have been a program for ladies. But it was a long-term program in which they brought the people in for a sufficient length of time so they could accomplish something.

The dollar amount in this bill does not seem to be a great amount in terms of our large budget, but it is a matter of principle and intent. All of us should evaluate very carefully whether this is the right way to be expanding our Government economy.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, the author of the bill.

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. MEEDS) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15361, the Youth Conservation Corps bill, of which I am a cosponsor. This legislation would establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps over the next 3 years for young people, ages 14 through 18, to work in conservation on Federal lands.

This bill has been approved by our House Committee on Education and Labor as part of the growing national concern with preservation and protection of our environment. Its intent is to establish a means to channel the dedication and enthusiasm of our young people for this meritorious cause into activities that will have a direct beneficial impact on our environment.

There is a great need for such services by our young people because of the tremendous increase in the public use of our wildlife refuges, parks, and national forests for recreation and other purposes. This extensive use increases soil and water conservation problems on these properties, and there are many such areas which could greatly benefit by the type of activities envisioned by this legislation.

In addition to the benefits gained by the public through the availability of improved recreational areas, the Youth Conservation Corps members themselves would benefit through wholesome, healthy outdoor activity on behalf of a worthy cause. This will increase the role and relevance of nature and the environment in their lives, an appreciation which is in their personal interest as well as the national interest.

The program would help meet the need for summer jobs for our youth. Unemployment for May was 5 percent for the Nation as a whole, but 14.3 percent for young people, an increase of 2 percent over last year. This legislation would provide timely help in a critical need.

Since no other existing programs are directed to the same ends, the Youth Conservation Corps would fill a measur-

able gap in our efforts to improve the environment. Federal agencies such as the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior with related programs have expressed an interest in cooperating with the proposed Corps in ways which would reap the greatest return for the modest investment to be made.

We proposed to invest \$3.5 million a year for 3 years in this pilot program to test the best means of implementing our objectives. At the conclusion of this period we will be in a better position to determine the future status and funding levels of such activities.

Young people of both sexes and all income levels would be encouraged to participate. We would take advantage, also, of experiences gained by the Job Corps and other programs available to youth so as to provide the most constructive and productive approaches possible.

There are many pressing goals in our society, but this program is one of the few that can produce benefits in many of the most critical areas. We would implement vital ecological work on our Federal lands at the same time that we attacked unemployment and alienation among young people.

Because of the great promise offered by this legislation, I urge my colleagues to support the Youth Conservation Corps bill.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I was shocked and saddened by the catch phrases which were used by my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, when he termed this a "kiddie corps" and a "babysitting venture." I think this shows a calloused disregard for the aspirations and the ability of the youth of this Nation. I certainly wish the gentleman could go with me to some of the programs I have seen operating, programs such as this. I am sure he would no longer feel they were babysitting or kiddie corps operations.

The young people are doing meaningful things in our national lands. They are creating trails and campsites and the types of things which we need very much today. I am sure they would not like to be considered as members of a kiddie corps.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is, indeed, patterned after the old CCC concept, a concept which enhanced the public lands of this Nation for years and enhanced a generation of Americans.

Despite the protestations of a minority on the committee, this is a bipartisan bill. Over 32 Members of this House of Representatives have sponsored this legislation. There were six Members from the side of the aisle of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is supported by more organizations than I have seen support a piece of legislation in a long time. I want to take the time to read who is supporting this legislation. This bill has support of: the Sierra Club, the Western Forest Industries Association, the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts of America, the National Wildlife Federation, the National Association of Counties, the National Rifle Association, the National Association of Secondary



School Principals, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the Izaak Walton League, the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, the American Forestry Association, the National Recreation and Parks Association, the National Forest Products Association, and the National Audubon Society.

I would like also, Mr. Chairman, to point out that this is a pilot program. This is a pilot program in which we want to test different methods. One of the great complaints coming from the other side of the aisle during the years we debated the Job Corps was that we dashed headlong into it and did not know what we were doing when we started it. I will venture to say perhaps we did not, and we found out to chagrin we did not. We should have tried some pilot programs, but we did not do so. We are suggesting on this type of program to start with a pilot program and test the concept, so when we have the program, we will have a good one, and we will know how to handle it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is an excellent program.

No one program is going to solve all the ills of the United States, foreign and domestic, but this is a bill which directs itself toward two of the most glaring problems the United States has today, the conservation of our natural resources and the conservation of our young people. Indeed, it is a bill that puts these two things together.

Somebody said over here in debate a moment ago that children from wealthy families could attend. Of course they can, because they are going out there to do an honest day's work. We expect to get dollar value out of their work.

This is not a program which is going to solve all the ills, but it will direct itself to two of our problems.

People are trying to make of it a complicated program. This is not a complicated program. It is a program premised on the belief that there is a lot of therapy in a good, hard day's work. It is not some big social program in which we will rush in with a lot of sociologists and check everything out. We just happen to believe that a good, hard day's work provides a lot of therapy. That work is going to be done in the areas where it needs to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, 5 million acres of national forest land in this country have been cut over and never reforested. Campsites, trails, picnic areas, and everything else must be built.

The use of our national parks will increase twofold from 1968 to 1975, and it will increase tenfold by the year 2000. What are we going to do?

Somebody pointed out that 600 miles of trails in the Olympic National Park alone have never been tended because we do not have people to do it.

Fourteen million board feet of softwood lumber is burned in this Nation or destroyed by insects and disease every

year. One billion board feet more than we produce, than we make lumber out of, are destroyed by fire and insects. Why cannot young people be put into the forests, to reforest, to fight disease, to fight fires, to fight insects which are attacking these trees?

This work is to be done by those people who need the work. Someone said that this was not a poverty program, and we can bet it is not a poverty program. All the young people of ages 14 to 18 are disadvantages in the respect that they cannot find employment. Some 16.4 percent of our young people last year, and probably 18 percent this year, are unemployed. There are 1.6 million young people who want jobs and cannot find them.

This is not going to solve that problem, but it does direct itself toward a solution of the problem by placing those people who are the most disadvantaged in terms of finding jobs in a position where they can get jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is a good purpose. It is a purpose to blend conservation and development of our natural resources with our most important resource, the youth of this Nation.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that there are many hundreds of camps in this country available for people who can afford to send their children to them, which are performing a very useful function.

Mr. MEEDS. Yes, I am well aware of that, but may I go on and say they are not conserving our natural resources. They are not building trails and campsites or replanting trees and the things such as I am talking about here.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY).

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill, which I am sponsoring along with several other members of the congressional delegations from the Pacific Northwest States. The bill and proposed program, however, have interest over a much wider area than just our part of the country. I think perhaps the best way to describe the legislation is to say that we are all aware of the pressing problems our society faces today: backlog of ecological work on Federal lands, unemployment, and alienation of some of our young people. Now I am not going to claim that the Youth Conservation Corps is a complete panacea for these problems, but I do believe that the program would attack these problems, and it should do this even in a limited way, as a quite effective way.

The Corps would be directly involved in conservation and improving the environment. It would have the responsibility of enhancing public lands by making campground improvements, building trails, planting trees and constructing soil erosion works. The YCC would cut substantially into a very heavy

backlog of much needed work on our public lands that has too long gone undone. In this respect it could be fairly stated that the Youth Conservation Corps would be in some ways similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps, known as CCC, of many years ago. But, there are some very profound differences. For one thing, the Youth Conservation Corps, as it is envisioned in the bill, would consist of youth of both sexes, ages 14 through 18. The Corps would be open to youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, and service as a member of the Corps would be limited to not more than 90 days during any single year.

Now the idea of a Youth Conservation Corps is not new, as I said. As a matter of fact, the concept has been discussed, off and on, for many years. I, myself, have introduced legislation about setting up a Youth Corps on two previous occasions since coming to Congress. But right now, in 1970, there seems to be a series of justifications for the program that are particularly compelling. Among these are the fact there is an urgent need for conservation work; the fact that the Youth Conservation Corps would be expected to provide experience of great educational value, directly to the enrollees and ultimately to the Nation; and finally, that the proposed program would help meet the need for summer jobs for youth. Of course there are other considerations such as the low cost of the program as compared with its benefits. If this is approved and enacted into law, it will be a "pilot program" however. Through such a pilot program a determination can be made as to how extensive a program of this sort would be desirable for the Nation. I have always thought that one of the major reasons for the initial problems we had with the Job Corps, was that there was not at first a pilot program to provide trial-and-error experience.

It seems to me that the Youth Conservation Corps would provide constructive "relevant" experience for restless youth who complain that they cannot find such experience in traditional school curricula. And at this time of great national concern over the quality of environment, the Youth Conservation Corps offers opportunities to contribute to the needs of a modern society.

I urge full support of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill. I have supported this concept in previous Congresses, and I am deeply gratified that this time we have the spelled out form of the project which I think has long been needed in this country. A great many of the remarks that I intended to make have been made by previous speakers. I think there have been some legitimate questions raised that need answering, particularly that of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE). I would like to give the gentleman, the original sponsor of the bill, an opportunity to respond further on this question of what I think is the strength of the bill. I do not believe we should make this a bill just to help those who are in deprived circumstances or in low economic circumstances, because in that



way we would lose the impact of the program.

I wonder if the gentleman would like me to yield to him so that he may further respond to the question of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Would the gentlewoman yield so that I can phrase the question more precisely?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of asking the question.

Mr. MAYNE. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Washington why it is that with such a stringency of Federal funds available at the present time the taxpayers of this country should be asked to pay for a summer camp for the children of affluent people. Do not these parents have some responsibility themselves to see to it that their children are not on the streets doing these horrendous things which some speakers have talked about? Is there not a very ample opportunity at least for the children of the well-to-do? Now, I am not opposed to having needy children put in these camps and given this opportunity, but I am very much at a loss to see why the taxpayers of the country should be sending affluent children to summer camps in beautiful mountain area of the country.

Mrs. MAY. I am limited as to time, and that is a question, I believe. Would the gentleman please respond?

Mr. MEEDS. If the gentlewoman will yield, I will be happy to respond.

First of all, I would like to point out, as I said earlier, that this is not a program where we are just attempting to provide jobs for people. I am trying to conserve our natural resources, our trees, our forests, and all of the other things that have to be done on our public lands. I think this is a responsibility of the Federal Government. We are going to ask the young people to go into the national forests and the public lands and work on them, and we are going to pay them. They will get what they deserve. Whether they are poverty stricken or are the youngsters of wealthy people does not make any difference. If they are performing a service, they should be paid for it.

Mrs. MAY. I would agree with my colleague from the State of Washington that the real strength of the bill, since its emphasis is on a contribution and in a very urgent area where contributions require a great deal of work and where there is a backlog of work in enhancing our public lands—I would agree that this job is so big that there should not be discrimination against a young person who wants to study and make a contribution and learn more about it on the basis of the facts. I do not believe that they should be discriminated against because their parents have money.

I would also comment, as I said before, that this is a pilot program. Perhaps the matter of contribution of money by those whose young people are working in this area could be taken up in some way, but I would say that it would be a great mistake to confine this bill only to those young people who would have to be found at a poverty level. Probably I

would end up by saying that a great many of the young people—and I feel it would be too bad if this happened—would be those who were motivated to work and contribute. However, I think it would be an artificial barrier to say that those young people who want to make a contribution in this very important field would be kept from doing so by virtue of their parents' wealth.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is a need for this type of program, which is contemplated in this legislation, the conservation of our natural resources in our country.

It seems to me there is also a need for wage earning experience among many of the youth of our country. I think those two things are very important things in this legislation.

One reason why I am on my feet at this moment is that earlier during the debate someone said something about the difficulty of choosing among the people who would be participants in this pilot program; and that there might be some problem along that line. I previously thought that would be so when some 20 years ago I started appointing pages in the House of Representatives. I wondered how I could choose between the hundreds of thousands of young people in my district as to whom should be appointed and that this would give rise to a lot of difficulty. As a matter of fact, I found it did not. As a matter of fact, I found that these young people carried back to others the message and value of their work experience here at the Nation's Capital; and this was a wonderful experience for everyone concerned. Perhaps this bill's effect could become, as with pages here, a real honor for those chosen. So much the better.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

(Mr. WYATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, to understand this bill, I think that we must understand it is a very modest program and that it has very modest goals. It has a relatively modest cost. I do not believe that anyone can truthfully look at this bill and know what is proposed to be accomplished if it is enacted and what is contained in it and then suggest that this is a federally financed summer camp program for children. It certainly is not. The needs have been very carefully spelled out, such as the millions of acres in this country of Federal timberland capable of growing timber which are not growing timber because they are not being reforested, the needs of maintaining the trails in our country, the needs of maintaining the firefighting potential so necessary, and stream clearance which is of the utmost importance in our country to mention only a few.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to concentrate if I may upon a few of the argu-

ments that have been used against this bill. I have read the minority views very carefully. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that they are subscribed to by a minority of the minority. I am sorry to find myself in opposition to them. However, it seems to me that the opposition would love this bill to death. They say, of course, that it is not limited to the disadvantaged. Therefore, it is no good. Second, they say it is for too short a period of time and that you cannot get anything going in that length of time. Finally, that during the period of time provided for there could be no useful work experience gained.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to examine each of these items very briefly.

I think the fact that this bill is not limited to the disadvantaged is one of the real strengths of this program. We have had program after program after program in this country designed specifically for the disadvantaged. I have had mail from people in my district saying, what are you doing for my son, what are you doing for my daughter?

The organizations which the minority suggest that this program competes with are all designed for the disadvantaged. There is no program designed for a person in the middle class or for a child of the wealthy. I might remind everyone in this Chamber that children of the wealthy, children of the middle class, use drugs; they become delinquents, they indeed kill themselves, and this despite the affluence into which they are born.

Mr. Chairman, if we are ever going to start picking up the pieces in this country and start working together, this modest effort would be a good starting point, the sharing of the work experience, the sharing of the outdoors experience, and the mingling of all socioeconomic classes.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very, very good, if modest, starting place.

I think it is about time that we started giving some thought to all of our youth, regardless of their socioeconomic backgrounds.

In regard to the 90-day period, this is not a Job Corps program, this is a program to improve our outdoors environment, to permit our young to know the woods, and the outdoors. Much can be done in a 90-day period. It is an entire summer.

I do not buy the argument that it is not useful work experience. Even if I agreed with that statement I would point out that this is not job training. It is an introduction to the great outdoors for our young people, with them performing many useful and much-needed jobs in the course of it.

Our friends in opposition say two things. They say that what is needed is a coordinated and all-inclusive program for youth as a part of a comprehensive manpower program—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WYATT. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, they say that the objectives can be achieved through other methods with-



out these methods being described. I do not believe that we need or that we want any huge, new, structured bureaucracy as suggested here. I think we need to provide a simple, inexpensive program, free of all the usual bureaucratic trappings, to make a real try to see if taking a given number of young people and introducing them to simple outdoor living and jobs is helpful in making useful citizens of them while at the same time improving our environment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

(Mrs. HANSEN of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, one of the rewards of being chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations is working with our youth.

A very dramatic work-learn program has been started on our Indian reservations. We did not go through the Committee on Education and Labor, and I today am rather grateful for it. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and my subcommittee members all have become very encouraged by the results, and we are gradually extending these programs.

Perhaps the most successful of these programs is on the Makah Reservation in the congressional district represented by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS). At Neah Bay, in the State of Washington, the Indian youths themselves administer the program. They clean up, fix, and paint their own reservation houses and facilities, and the results are outstanding. I have here for any Member to see a copy of the report on the Makah's program. Each of you should glance at it before voting on H.R. 15361. It came into being because we realized that many young people need pocket money to attend school, and they also need the opportunity to participate in the development and in the growth of their own Indian reservations. The results are shown by their enthusiasm and by the success of their programs.

The bill before the Committee today in my estimation sets out to do for all American young people what already is being done on our various Indian reservations.

The Youth Conservation Corps, as provided for in this bill, gives 3,000 young people a chance to work in conservation on our Federal lands. Across those 754 million acres there is plenty of work, and I am sure that the \$3.5 million annual appropriation authorized under this bill will be returned manifold. And if you could sit and listen to the hearings of our committee and the testimony there presented as to the number of trails developed, the areas of forest lands that have been saved by our young people working on them, you would be convinced. Not only will there be improvements on the land, but the young people involved have an investment of labor in their land.

Young people become involved, have an investment of labor in their land, and come to love in a special way this land of ours.

This bill provides a 3-year pilot program. If the Youth Conservation Corps is successful, and judging from the experience with the Makah Indians, it will be successful, the Congress can then expand and develop the program for the benefits of our public lands and for the benefit of young people.

After months of studying the budget as well as the administration of our public lands, I am sure these 3,000 new workers and \$3½ million in the additional budget can be used most economically and most prudently.

I am happy to be a sponsor of the legislation and intend to vote for it as well as urge all of you to vote for it.

Young people need our help. The Nation needs our young people and their services to our land. Together we have the important partnership which is America.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the gentlewoman's remarks and say I appreciate very much what she has just said and would join her wholeheartedly in her remarks.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

I might say to those who say that this is not a program for the rich or the poor that neither is the draft a program for the rich and the poor. Neither is any other American program. This is a program for every young American. Let us hope that we keep America that way for every young person—a program to grow, live, survive and help our country to build itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding, and I rise in support of the bill H.R. 15361.

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the objectives of the Youth Conservation Corps Act are twofold: First, to develop and maintain our public land resources; and second, to provide a practical education for our young people through training and experience.

More and more people each year are enjoying our national parks and forests, and, of course, the heaviest use occurs during the summer months. There is a great need for extra temporary help at this time to supplement the excellent job done by the U.S. Forest Service. The greater summer use means that there is more work to be done to maintain trails and clean up campsites as well as such long-range projects as revegetation, erosion control, and wildlife habitat improvement.

The Youth Conservation Corps Act would be a 3-year pilot program employing approximately 3,000 young people

ages 14 to 18 for 3 months. It would enroll youth of all social, economic, and racial backgrounds—offering them an opportunity to work together, to shoulder the responsibility of wage earning and to aid in the conservation of our natural resources.

They would learn the physical skills of using tools and the personal skills of working effectively and constructively on jobs they could be proud of—jobs that would represent a meaningful contribution to their country.

There is concern that this program would be a duplication of Federal programs already established—in particular the Neighborhood Youth Corps, community action programs, and the Job Corps. The Youth Conservation Corps would share with programs that might be considered comparable to the aim of employment for youth, but it would be unique in that it would provide those jobs solely in forest conservation. Also, it is aimed not only at those ordinarily thought of as disadvantaged; it would bring together young people of various backgrounds that they might have the added benefit of learning from each other.

The need of our youth for the kind of training and experience the Youth Conservation Corps would offer and the need of our country for the benefits of such a program are clear. The Youth Conservation Corps would represent a wise investment in our public lands and in our young citizens.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

(Mr. MYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose as I understand it of this bill certainly cannot be argued—to teach young people, 14 to 18 or regardless of age, we may finally agree to, to work. The other purpose I understand is to improve and develop our public lands as a better place to enjoy our environment.

I do wonder, however, if this is really the best way to accomplish either one of those two purposes?

I can recall back a few months ago we had the so-called National Timber Supply Act which was intended also to improve our national forests. However, that particular bill would not have cost the taxpayers anything but merely would have provided that as timber was cut on our national forests, and not extending this cutting of national forest virgin timber wilderness areas, but provided that the money from harvested forests would go into a trust fund to build roads and improve our national forests.

But I notice that three of the favoring groups of those who want this bill, the Izaak Walton League, the Sierra Club, and the National Audubon Society all violently opposed that particular bill. It also is of interest that a majority of the authors of this legislation opposed the National Timber Supply Act.

I wonder why we accomplish or want to accomplish something now by digging into the taxpayers pockets when we had an opportunity just a few months ago to do the same job by setting up a trust



fund of profits from timber sales and now are going to get it from the general treasury?

I wonder if one of the authors of the bill who opposed the Timber Supply Act or the chairman of the committee might be able to answer why we are asking the poor, overburdened, hard working taxpayer to do the same job now.

Since no one responds in answer to that question, I assume they would rather spend the taxpayers' money than to spend the profits from the national forest that now go into the general treasury.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it may be that I should not get into this debate because I do not pose as an expert in the areas that are generally proposed to be covered by the legislation. But I do have some questions that bother me, because I do know something about what can be expected, of children in some of these age groups, just from a personal knowledge.

I wonder, since you suggest here that this is not for the purpose of being a summer camp for the disadvantaged or a particular group of children, and it is really designed to improve our outdoors and the environment, whether we really have paid much attention to what a young person of 14 or 15 years of age is capable of doing in this area, and the desirability in some respects of taking a 14-year-old and putting him in with 17- and 18-year-olds in terms of living together. If my experience means anything, it does mean that there is quite a little difference between a young boy 14 years of age and a young man who is 17 or 18. I would think, frankly, the proposal here would have much more meaning if it were the 16-, 17-, 18- and 19-year-old level that you were talking about.

Is there anything that the proponent or the author of the legislation can say to give us some confidence that there is some real meaning rather than dangers in having this program encompass the 14- and 15-year-old young person? For example, you cite the case of a witness before the committee, Mr. Louis Clapper, who tells about the experience of his son, 18. I can agree to that. I think we can all understand the meaningfulness and the contribution that can be made doing a day's work by an 18-year-old or by a 17-year-old. It begins to be more questionable when the 16-year-old is involved. But I think it is much more questionable when you think it is realistic to expect 14-year-old or 15-year-old boys doing a day's work, 8 hours, for 5 days a week.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. I will not take much of the gentleman's time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am seeking information on the program.

Mr. MEEDS. There are programs operating today, similar to the proposed program, in which they do have 14-, 15-, 16-, 17-, and 18-year-old children participating.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What I am asking particularly about are those in the 14- and 15-year age group. Would they have to do a days work, or even 5 hours for 5 days a week?

Mr. MEEDS. No, they do not. That is correct. But, for example, they can plant trees. They can do a lot of things. Someone will propose an amendment. I do not want my judgment to be the judgment of the House. Let us vote it up or down and determine if the age should be 16, 17, or 18—

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thought maybe I could get some assistance from the author of the legislation as to the reason for including those 14 and 15 years of age.

Mr. MEEDS. Yes. We studied the programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, pilot programs can be good. And this program can be good. It will be just as good or bad as its administration.

We have in my congressional district a pilot program underway for the first time, begun just a week ago today. This pilot program makes use of the physical facilities of one of our Air Force installations. Youngsters who participate in this pilot program are sent there by mutual agreement by the juvenile courts.

A private sponsor, unknown to the public, pays the entire cost of feeding and clothing these youngsters while they are there, and pays for their incidentals. They draw no salary as is proposed here.

The military has approved this pilot project there. They provide the facilities and the personnel who direct these youngsters for the few weeks they are there. The program was begun a week ago today. Just last Saturday morning I talked at length with the base commander at Barksdale Air Force Base, Col. Marvin Anding. Colonel Anding told me I would not believe the change for the better that had come over those youngsters in just 1 week.

They are not there to train to be members of the military. They are there to be indoctrinated in the American way of life and to work while they are there and to take exercise and to make a contribution for their upkeep.

This pilot program which is proposed here, which will create this Youth Conservation Corps, can be good. I do not believe anybody can argue with its purposes, so, therefore, we should limit our consideration to the policies proposed by the bill. I want to take a moment or two to talk about those policies to see if we can get more perspective as to what we intend, and I would like to have answers from the chairman of the com-

mittee or from any other member of the committee who wants to provide me with these answers. It is my understanding from reading the bill that this bill is not intended to be a fun summer camp, but it is intended to be by and large a work program.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct. There is wide latitude given to the Departments of Interior and Agriculture to motivate the youngsters with needed conservation work.

Mr. WAGGONNER. It is my further understanding that, because this is not final legislation but is legislation which provides for a pilot program, in coping with the problems of selecting just 3,000 youngsters for this pilot program there will be some leeway or latitude given to the committee who will lay down the guidelines, but it is basically intended that they give consideration to the country as a whole and to the youth of every strata. Is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, because every State in the Union has national forests administered by the Department of Agriculture, and we have the National Parks administered by the Department of Interior throughout the country.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I asked that question, and I am pleased with the gentleman's answer, because we in Louisiana have these facilities too.

At first blush it would appear to me some criticism could be directed toward the fact that those who are without need are accorded the same treatment that those with need are accorded, but on second glance it seems to me this is entirely wise, because when we review the problems of our youth today, it is quickly evident that the lack of understanding and problems of our youth are not limited to the indigent alone. So I am glad we are giving this opportunity to all our youth regardless of their strata of life, to give them an opportunity to understand some of these resources and make their contribution to their future. It is not intended, is it, that we would utilize the \$3.5 million to be made available on an annual basis to provide facilities, to build initially new facilities? Is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. Only for personnel, because for this pilot program we have adequate facilities now available to us through the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman I yield my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, 1 additional minute.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I have one other question. We are providing a pilot program for 3,000 youngsters which authorizes the appropriation of \$3.5 million a year. Is it intended that this \$3.5 million pay the total cost of the operation of the program, for such things as whatever salaries are involved, let us say, and whatever transportation is involved, and whatever food and clothing are provided, and whatever medical care is required, for example?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.



Mr. WAGGONER. If my arithmetic is correct, the cost of this program in its entirety will be about \$1,166 per youngster per year.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. WAGGONER. This does not seem exorbitant to me. I believe we will reap many times that benefit in the years to come. I support the legislation because it is at least worth a try.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania 1 minute of my time.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I do so for several reasons.

First, as our distinguished colleague from Louisiana has pointed out, this is a program which is available to all the youth of America. The problems of youth are not confined to those who are underprivileged. The fact of the matter is a lot of the problems we are having in this country come from the youth of this country who are overprivileged.

It might be a very good idea to let some of our young people know that there is such a thing as hard work, that there is such a thing as the opportunity to make a daily contribution for a period of 3 months in the summer to bettering one's own physical condition and to bettering some sections of the country and to giving a contribution to one's country.

One of the important things we should recognize is that this is not a military operation. This is an operation that will be conducted probably in some of the areas that have been closed by the OEO, where we have facilities and where we have operated camps similar to the CCC camps. This is the kind of proposition that should be made available.

Someone has come to me and said that we should not have this program, because it might be a duplication. No program that I know of is going to be duplicated by this program.

The other day we passed a program for living history in the parks, to allow the Park Service to use certain youths for work in our national parks. The important thing is that those young people are going to contribute their time and their energy. The only thing we provided for in that bill was to provide some transportation and some medical expense, if there were any.

Very frankly, we must realize there are vast areas of this country which are in Federal ownership, which need looking into, which need to have trails built in them. This is where these young people will work. This is where they can contribute the most. This is where they can make a contribution which will be lasting.

I doubt if there is any Member of this body who has not been in a national forest or in a State forest or in an area that still has some of the benefits of the CCC camps which were built and operated in the middle 1930's. This proved to be one of the best things the Government has

ever done, and I am sure that these will follow the same pattern.

I urge that with an amendment increasing the age to 16 that this bill will pass.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

I believe some confusion has reigned in the House, in trying to compare those programs with the Civilian Conservation Corps. That is quite erroneous. That was not a child's program; that was a man's program. I am sure if the facts could be developed, they would not allow them to participate at the tender age of 14 years, and particularly boys and girls.

In the program at that time there was the same considered evaluation, that eligibility had to be the same as working for WPA. This was an unemployment program, a poverty program.

I cannot help but believe that we are going to end up funding nothing more than a huge recreation program, particularly when we bring in all the socioeconomic groups in the country.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970. I believe this proposal to be a challenging and constructive effort to direct the energies of American youth into productive channels—the preservation of our national resources.

I can see the wonderful results of enacting this bill by looking at my own district. In the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, there are at present only 1,630 campsites—not nearly enough for the 8-percent rise in visitors to the park each summer. If just seventy young people work in the BWCA, the number of available campsites could increase to 3,175 over 5 years. And those campsites now in use could be improved.

A second reason for passing this bill is the strong demand for employment we hear this summer from our Nation's youth. They need work. They need money for their education. They need the experience of producing tangible results through their own efforts. They need to be occupied for the summer. And we need them.

I support this legislation because since 1959 I have strongly advocated programs to provide work experience for young people and in the 81st and succeeding Congresses I authored legislation to create a streamlined junior version of the CCC. Three times, we succeeded in getting this legislation reported out of the Education and Labor Committee, but each time it was deadlocked in the Rules Committee.

Finally, in 1964, President Johnson included the YCC proposals in his anti-poverty program as the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps, respectively, and both proved to be successful.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this new proposal, for the benefit of our national parks, forests, and recreation areas, and for the education and experience which our youth so desperately need. This program of work for young people is a healthy sign of constructive action in one area, youth, that certainly demands action.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 15361 which estab-

lishes a 3-year pilot program employing about 3,000 youths between the ages of 14 and 18 during the summer on public lands.

Back in 1964, 1965, and 1966 I introduced similar legislation when I was a Senator in the Rhode Island General Assembly. My bill was designed to establish a Youth Conservation Corps to develop Rhode Island's natural resources.

I am gratified that the Education and Labor Committee of the House has seen fit to act favorably on this legislation. This bill is particularly worthwhile for it will have the twofold effect of helping some of our youths and also protecting our natural resources. This bill acts to complement our many other employment programs in the United States. All of these bills are designed to benefit the labor force and thus the whole economy.

I hope my colleagues will support this bill.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my support for the establishment of the 3-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps. The benefit from this modest annual investment of \$3.5 million in our Nation's youth and in our conservation efforts will far exceed the actual cost.

It is my belief that the merit of such a program by far outweighs the expense. The benefits that will be derived are many and varied. They differ from those benefits derived from either the Job Corps civilian conservation centers or the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. For example, whereas the Job Corps is restricted to 14- to 21-year-old disadvantaged male youths, the proposed program includes all youths between 14 and 18. A further difference is that the emphasis of the Youth Conservation Corps will be on conservation of land and resources rather than on education and training.

With the ever-increasing pressures on our lands, forests, and parks, there is an urgent need to intensify efforts directed toward preservation. Such a program as this can be an immense aid. The participants will have the responsibility of both improving and maintaining our resources. There can be, for example, increased reforestation and watershed construction.

In addition to the value of the program to our conservation efforts, there will be manifold benefits for the enrollees. First of all, of course, they will have the opportunity for meaningful work, since they will be helping to preserve a vital part of our Nation.

Also, their participation will be highly educational. They will develop an appreciation and understanding of conservation. The inclusion of participants of both sexes, from ages 14 to 18, regardless of race or economic background, gives rise to a unique opportunity for developing cooperation and tolerance, two traits much needed today.

Our experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930's demonstrated the effectiveness of young people in conservation efforts. Youths, at even the age of 14, are quite capable of giving worthwhile contributions in this area. Their ability to help has been proven in



times of emergency, such as flooding or tornado destruction.

The benefits that will be derived from the passage of this bill is necessary to the future well-being of our Nation. We must continue in our efforts both to preserve our national resources and to better educate our youth for the problems of tomorrow. By adopting this bill, I believe that we will be taking important steps toward accomplishing both.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the Youth Conservation Corps created by H.R. 15361 is an attractive and worthwhile concept. The Corps seeks to benefit both youth and conservation, and I intend to vote for it. Certainly, both of these subjects have been primary concerns of mine.

However, in supporting this bill, I am mindful that it is not an entirely satisfactory piece of legislation. I hope that the record made today by the debate on H.R. 15361 will serve to make it clear where some of the potential problems lie, in order that the program may thereby be benefited.

My first concern is the failure of the bill to provide adequate protection for the youths who would participate in the Youth Conservation Corps. Specifically, I should like to see language added to section 3(b) of H.R. 15361 making clear that, when the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee determines the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps, it precludes the assignment of Corps members to forest fire fighting.

My concern in this regard stems from past history. For a number of years, the youths assigned to Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers, which are operated by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior pursuant to interagency agreements with the Department of Labor—and, prior to the delegation of Job Corps to the Labor Department on July 1, 1969, with the Office of Economic Opportunity—were used for fighting forest fires.

These youths were sent into dangerous situations, for which they often had insufficient training. They received no pay for their efforts, even though the professional firefighters alongside of whom they worked were being paid the high wages which such dangerous and strenuous work warrants. There was always some question as to whether these youths were "volunteers" or whether they were "encouraged" to go out and fight these fires, either by their supervisors or by their own enthusiasm for excitement.

However they got to the fireline, the fact remained that they were engaged in dangerous work. This danger was made very clear in August of 1968, when seven Los Angeles County juvenile probationers assigned to similar work were killed fighting a brush fire in the San Gabriel mountains. These youths were not in Job Corps, nor were they under the direction of Job Corps. But their tragedy heightened the concern about Job Corps' utilization of Corpsmen for firefighting.

In light of this concern, the headquarters personnel of Job Corps undertook to reexamine their policy. They did so despite the views of the Departments of

the Interior and Agriculture, which saw this firefighting as helpful and worthwhile.

While the Department of Labor's child labor regulations did not preclude the use of youths as firefighters, the arguments were strong for discontinuing the practice. One argument was based on the Los Angeles tragedy. Another was based on the fact that several States as well as Puerto Rico set 18 as the minimum age for employment of minors in jobs either injurious to health, or involving logging-type operations—Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Utah. The Maryland provision by implication precludes actual firefighting by minors under the age of 18. And in Wisconsin, minors under 18 are precluded from working as firemen, volunteer or otherwise, except in emergencies.

A third factor entered into Job Corps' considerations when a bill was introduced in the 1969 California State Legislature session which amended the California Welfare and Institutions Code so as to limit the use of youths under the age of 18 for fire suppression work. The bill allowed wards in the State under age 18 to be assigned to fire suppression work only if: First, the parent or guardian of the youth had given permission for such labor; second, the youth had received training equivalent in number of training hours to that received by persons in apprenticeship for firefighters; and, third, all other available manpower had been used.

In light of all these factors, Job Corps has recently adopted a new regulation concerning the use of Corps members in forest-fire fighting. Section 712 of the Civilian Conservation Center Administrative Manual now provides that only volunteers may be assigned to this work. Moreover, no volunteer under the age of 18 will be accepted. In addition youths who do participate in firefighting must be graduates of a fire-suppression training course, and they must be paid at the rates received by professional firefighters.

None of these protections embodied either in the California bill or Job Corps' regulation are contained in H.R. 15361. And, in light of the Department of the Interior's and the Department of Agriculture's resistance to the Job Corps regulation, it is doubtful that such a regulation will be adopted for the Youth Conservation Corps, which is to be run by an interagency committee, two-thirds of the members of which will be representatives of these two agencies.

So, one problem with H.R. 15361 is that it leaves open the door to sending untrained boys and girls into dangerous forest fire situations.

A second problem concerns the troika administration contemplated. To carry out the purposes of H.R. 15361, a Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee is to be established, composed of representatives of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and the Interior.

As I said earlier, the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior operate Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers.

And many of the problems these centers have experienced stem from the bureaucratic tangle of a multiagency effort. I would hope that this tangle is avoided with regard to the Youth Conservation Corps.

A third problem with the Youth Conservation Corps concerns transportation costs. I am aware that section 3(b)(3) of H.R. 15361 contains language specifically directed at limiting these costs:

That to minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

I am also aware that the Legislative Reference Service report prepared on H.R. 15361 at the request of the Committee on Education and Labor states this restrictive language would prevent long-distance transportation, which was supposedly conducted by the Job Corps which it describes as follows:

One of the causes of disillusionment with the Job Corps has been the busing of youngsters across the country from Florida to Oregon and Oregon to Florida.

And the report goes on to maintain that "such unnecessary expense would be prohibited" by the language of H.R. 15361.

First, there are no Job Corps centers in Florida. There was one, briefly, in St. Petersburg, and this was a small center limited to women. Second, the history of Job Corps transportation has never involved major transportation except from the Southeast to other areas, this being because most enrollees come from that region, which has very few Job Corps centers.

Finally, I would note that this argument is misleading in pointing to the restrictive language in regard to transportation and claiming that this is a distinction from Job Corps' authorizing legislation. In fact, section 106(d) of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, which authorizes Job Corps, contains similar language. And the history of Job Corps is a history of high transportation costs.

But most importantly, I would note that if this language in H.R. 15361 is read so as to encourage or force the operating agencies of the program to limit transportation expenses, the entire eastern seaboard, with its teeming ghettos, will suffer, since there are few closeby areas to which youths from this part of the country can be sent.

Thus, I would very much hope that the restrictive language concerning transportation not be read so stringently as to penalize the youths who reside east of the Mississippi. They deserve, perhaps even more than many of the youngsters who already live in relatively open areas, a chance to receive the benefits which the Youth Conservation Corps can provide.

My final concerns regarding H.R. 15361 center around the concepts it opens up. I would very much hope that the intelligent awareness of both the needs of our youth and the needs of our environment which this bill represents are picked up and vastly expanded.

I would note, for example, the terrible



problem of unemployment afflicting the teenagers of the country. In April of this year, the unemployment rate among black teenagers stood at 32.7 percent. They desperately need help—they need jobs and they need skill training.

Thus, while H.R. 15361 addresses one of the disadvantages which so many of our youth experience, it should also serve as a wedge to foster greater awareness of the as yet unmet needs which remain. For example, the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program desperately needs additional funding. As I said on the floor this past May 25:

The disadvantaged youth who are eligible for Neighborhood Youth Corps urgently need the opportunity to participate in it. They have been consistently rejected from the mainstream of our society and our economy, and to deny them even the bare minimum opportunity which this program offers is simply unjustifiable.

For lack of funding, Neighborhood Youth Corps cannot accept the 227,000 youths in its summer program who need the money and the experience. For this reason, I urged on May 25 that an additional \$100 million be provided for the program this summer. And to that end I have introduced H.R. 18068.

Not only is Neighborhood Youth Corps starving for funds, Job Corps is, as well. And Job Corps certainly is a program which meets the conservation function proposed by H.R. 15361, as well as providing skill training and remedial education. I would point to section 106(e) of the Economic Opportunity Act, which specifically states:

Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those enrollees are assigned to conservation centers . . . or to other centers or projects where their work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, development, or management of public natural resources or recreational areas.

The youth of our country need help. The Youth Conservation Corps may be one answer, but certainly Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps are also answers. And they should receive the funds which they need, so that they may help youngsters desperately seeking a chance to help themselves.

Finally, I find very worthwhile the aim of serving the needs of conservation, as the Youth Conservation Corps proposes to do. But, the ecology of our cities is in dire straits, and here too youth can participate. Provide money for them to build vest pocket parks. Provide money for youths to work on rehabilitating old buildings. Provide money to maintain city parks. Provide money to clean up shorelines. Provide money to build neighborhood pools. In every one of these endeavors, youth can participate. And, what is more, they will have the benefit of being able to use and enjoy the fruits of their own work, done in their own neighborhoods and cities.

In sum, the Youth Conservation Corps is a step. It is a pilot program, and we shall see how it works out. There are pitfalls; hopefully they will be avoided. But, in addition, there are many steps yet to be taken. And they must be taken quickly. Our children are impatient, and rightly so.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth, representing all segments of society, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of natural resources of the United States by the youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established a Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee composed of representatives of the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor who shall administer a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions who have attained age fourteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee may employ, without regard for civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purposes of providing gainful employment, generating understanding, and developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States.

(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. (a) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee shall be composed of six persons. The Secretaries of the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor shall each designate two persons to serve on the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee, with one, at least, of the two designees being an employee of the respective department. Each member of the Interagency Committee shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary appointing him. The Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, in consultation, shall name the Chairman of the Interagency Committee.

(b) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee shall:

(1) designate the public lands upon which members of the Corps can be effectively utilized in conservation work, and coordinate Corps efforts with those holding jurisdiction over the respective public lands;

(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) arrange for transportation, lodging, subsistence, other services and equipment for the needs of members of the Corps in fulfilling their duties: *Provided*, That whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities (including abandoned military installations) shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps, *And pro-*

*vided further*, That to minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

(4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members;

(5) give employment preference for temporary supervisory personnel to primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resource disciplines;

(6) prepare a report, indicating the most efficient method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resources, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

(c) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support staff.

#### INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE REPORTS

SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Interagency Committee shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 2, line 16, strike the word "fourteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sixteen".

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, judging from the comments I have heard this afternoon, I think there is some merit to this legislation if these young people will actually do some work and if they are involved in conservation work so that it will be of benefit to other people as well as themselves. However, it is hard for me to believe that any of you who have children 14 years of age would want them to go to live in a camp with some 18-year-olds. Now, there is a lot of difference between children 14 and 18 years of age and a lot of difference between children who have been close to their homes and those who have been roaming the streets for a long time. For that reason I think



it would be better to change the minimum age from 14 to 16. It is quite acceptable that 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds be put together. If we are only talking about 3,000 of them, then let us find out if this program works with the 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds before we start taking care, as one of my colleagues said, of them at the tender age of 14 or 15.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota that personally I well understand his argument and for that reason there is no objection to his amendment. Personally I accept the amendment. I think it would be a good point to make if 16 years of age, particularly in view of the small number of enrollees the funding authorizations permit.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

I may also remind my colleagues of what the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) said in referring to the CCC camps. Young men not 14-year-olds were in CCC. There would not have been the results from the CCC camps if they depended on 14- or 15-year-olds. In fact, I certainly would never have wanted my children in those camps when they were 14 years old, judging from the things that I know went on there. To permit 14-year-olds to go in there I think would have been completely wrong. No matter what you do there will always be some difficulty, but with proper supervision I believe we can handle those who are in the age group of 16 to 18 years old. Therefore I hope that all of my colleagues will support the amendment I have offered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. The thing that intrigues me is how this committee voted out the bill with an age of 14 and now it is marching half way down the hill to age 16. How did this bill ever get out of the committee with the 14-year age limit?

Mr. QUIE. I will answer the gentleman from Iowa. I did not like the idea myself and I voted against the bill in the committee, but sometimes I am outvoted there and some of my other colleagues are, too. That is what happened in this case. Evidently a majority of the committee wanted it at the age of 14 through 18 and evidently the chairman of the committee feels the same way I do.

Mr. GROSS. I have heard most of the debate this afternoon and I have heard nearly everyone give unqualified support for it at age 14 to 19. I did not hear anyone oppose it, much less the chairman of the committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and all of the rest of them said that this was a good bill, and I did not suppose you would come in here and march half way down the hill, in the way that you have, on the matter of age.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to my colleague from Iowa that sometimes items are classed as good, better, or best, and it would be better, I believe, if you change the age from 14 to 16.

Mr. GROSS. Well, they capitulate easily in the Labor and Education Committee.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

(Mr. ZWACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZWACH. I thank the gentleman for yielding and wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my colleague from Minnesota. It is my opinion that with the adoption of the amendment which the gentleman has offered we will have a lot of good potential in this legislation and I believe it should be passed.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. GREEN OF OREGON

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Page 3, on line 25, after the word "arrange," insert the following: "directly or by contract with any public agency, or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for five years."

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding when the bill was pending in the committee that it would be possible for a public school district or a private organization such as the national Boy Scouts and the national Girl Scouts as well as other organizations to conduct a program which might run for any period of time up to 90 days—it might be for 2 weeks or a month or a longer period of time.

I explained a few moments ago the very successful program which is run by the Portland school district and the gentleman from Louisiana has told me of the very highly successful program that is run in his State.

It seems to me we should make the language abundantly clear—and the main handler of the bill has told me that he does not think it does at this time—that we do intend to make it possible to contract with the school district or such an organization which has been in existence for 5 years so that fly-by-night organizations would not be involved and in this way these organizations could carry out programs which do meet the main objectives of the program.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. The gentlewoman is exactly correct. We did discuss this, as a matter of fact, before the bill was perfected. The gentlewoman from Oregon was going to offer an amendment to this effect in the committee but, unfortunately, she was involved in other mat-

ters which were pending before the committee and the bill came out and she did not have an opportunity to offer this amendment in the committee. So, the gentlewoman is absolutely correct. We had discussed this.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me compliment the gentlewoman for offering the amendment. In fact, I feel she has made a contribution and I, certainly, on the part of the committee, want to accept the amendment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank both of the distinguished gentlemen.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I too compliment the gentleman from Oregon for offering this amendment. This is what I had in mind in the very beginning when we were talking about the various organizations that are affected by this bill. The one we overlooked, the distinguished gentlewoman has now included and that is the taxpayers of this country.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATTA: On page 2, strike out lines 8 through 22, and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corps'). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age \_\_\_\_\_ but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ during the summer months without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary."

On page 3, strike out lines 1 through 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### "SECRETARIAL DUTIES

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall:

Page 4, line 23, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)".

Page 5, line 3, strike out "Interagency Committee" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretarial".

Page 5, line 5, strike out "Interagency Committee" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture".

Page 5, line 16, strike out "Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture".



Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, it is to strike the Interagency Committee, and to lodge the carrying out of the programs in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture and to delete the Department of Labor; am I correct?

Mr. LATTA. That is correct. The amendment does carry out the agreement that was reached before the Committee on Rules to make the program strictly a conservation program, and not a manpower training program. That is the reason for deleting the Department of Labor.

I would hasten to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has already adopted an amendment dealing with the age limits, and I will offer an amendment to make the age limits in my amendment correspond to this amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will yield further, let me state that in the original Civilian Conservation Corps the Department of Labor was not involved, except at one time in the recruiting. And inasmuch as we are including today the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior to administer the program and giving them the latitude that they need to come up with the best pilot program possible, I would accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, subject to the correction of the age, which amendment he will offer in a moment.

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman is correct.  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA TO HIS AMENDMENT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATTA to his amendment: Section 2, line 7, strike out "fourteen" and insert "sixteen".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) to his amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. Do I understand the correction to be 16 through 18?

Mr. LATTA. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 4, strike paragraph (5), lines 11 through 15, and redesignate paragraph (6) as paragraph (5).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized.

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the reason why I propose to strike this is not to prohibit the teachers, the administrators and the university students who have the capability to seek temporary supervisory jobs but rather if a person who had substantial capabilities of working in conservation work, for instance, somebody who might have been previously employed by the U.S. Forest Service and wanted to spend the summer in work but was not in a school system could have an equal chance for that type of work.

I would expect that the Forest Service and the Park Service to look on those teachers as the ones who are available at that time who had some competence in this work. But I do not believe we ought to give preference to them as though this bill were something to protect their right to hold jobs. I think they ought to be considered with every other type of person who had the capability.

The most important part, it seems to me, is the Forest Service and the Park Service determine the capability of a person to be a supervisor.

I know that in some cases in the Western States a number of teachers spend their summers working out in the forest lands. In other parts of the country, since the way this bill is drafted, you could eventually include any kind of public land—that same capability does not exist with the teaching profession and does not necessarily exist with the students from institutions of higher education.

As was indicated before, this hopefully is not going to be a recreation program.

I would prefer we just leave it to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to make the determination of which personnel could handle this job most effectively.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would just want to ask if you would agree that the situation has changed considerably in terms of surplus teachers and that now we do have a decided surplus of teachers and if we leave in the words that they shall be given preference, we are liable to end up with all employees in all of the camps exclusively teachers and it would be much better to have a cross-section—people who are experts in conservation, ecology, forestry, wildlife management, and so forth.

Mr. QUIE. I would say, I believe the gentlewoman is absolutely correct. But I stated I had no objection to teachers—I just want to make certain that others have an equal chance with teachers to get a job.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I rise in support of this amendment because it does seem to me highly desirable not to have supervisors—exclusively teachers. But certainly I would hope that many teachers who have had a lifetime

of preparation and make a profession of working with young people would be a part of it.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes because I think the issue is pretty well decided. But I must oppose this.

First of all, because I feel that the people who are given the preference in education—an employment opportunity—are indeed the best people to deal with these young people who will be involved.

Second, I wish the gentleman had not gone quite so far with his amendment. I think maybe I could have been able to support it then. I definitely think university students pursuing studies in education and national resources disciplines ought to be given some preference.

I think this entire program affords us a very wonderful opportunity to begin some environment studies. I speak of the types of studies where young people who are involved in resource management will begin to get ideas for education in the ecology. Today we have very few programs in ecology, ecological education, and I think we need not only programs but we are going to need people to teach and to run these programs. I think the program we have before us today furnishes an excellent laboratory for these young men and women to get the ideas which will later become the curricula and the programs which will turn out to be hopefully environmental education types of curricula. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

I would not be nearly as opposed, however, if purpose were given to students studying in the natural resource field.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman that the Forest Service and the Park Service have summer hiring programs for 18-year-olds and above, college students, and the ones who have this capability could be utilized for this type of program as well as working on the trails. There is nothing to prevent the Forest Service and the Park Service from hiring students who are studying in the fields of ecology and environment. But the program could easily go further, if they were utilized in that way, rather than as you proposed.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman agree with me, so we can establish some legislative history here, that it is extremely important that people involved in the studies of the natural resources, the natural resource disciplines and ecological students would be very excellent people, assuming that their other qualifications were also good, that they would be excellent people to be involved in this program because of what I said earlier, in developing ecological studies?

Mr. QUIE. I think the gentleman is correct. It would be very worthwhile during their college years if they had an opportunity to work with other supervisory personnel in this type of program. But I



do not think they should be primarily teachers, for if there is a large number of them, nobody else would be hired.

Mr. MEEDS. I thank the gentleman. I still oppose the amendment.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Washington keeps referring to this Youth Conservation Corps as a training program. I hesitate to list this program as such. In my humble opinion, I think it would be better termed recreation program than a training program. However, along the same lines, as far as supervisory personnel is concerned, I think the gentleman from Washington would be wise to accept this amendment, because I can predict here and now that there will be difficulty in finding capable supervisory personnel who will take this job for 90 days during the summer months.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. I hate to disagree with the gentleman, but we have this type of program going in Washington State right now, in the Olympic National Park, not only a program which takes in 250 young people, but one for which we have 3,000 applications. There are a number of teachers and advisers, and they always have many, many more applications for those jobs than they can possibly accept.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, I point out once again the cost estimates that appear on page 20 of the hearings. The center staff salaries of a 200-man center are estimated at \$406. Do you really believe you are going to get capable staff personnel to travel to some remote area and be employed in a supervisory capacity for less than \$100 a week? I seriously doubt that it is possible. You cannot hire them for that amount of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to direct a question to the chairman of the full committee or to the gentleman from Washington, the primary author of the bill, as to how they would define or explain gainful employment. The term appears on line 4, page 1, and on line 20, page 2.

I specifically would refer to a pilot program. I may say my enthusiastic support of this bill is based on the fact that I would hope we could have several different types of pilot projects. It would seem to me—and I would say this in preface so the chairman would know what I was directing my question to—that if we had one pilot project that had 18-year-old boys for 90 days, they might well be paid \$2 an hour or whatever the people decided was required. On the other hand, if a school system decides they want to rotate during the summer and take out three different groups of people for a month, or, as the gentleman from Lou-

isiana suggested, the program in his State which operates to take them out for 3 or 4 weeks, and they decide they do not want to give any particular salary, there might be this leeway in terms of the actual money received.

Would the chairman of the committee interpret it to mean, on page 3, when we are giving authority to determine the rates of pay and hours and other conditions of employment, coupled with the arrangement for transportation and lodging and subsistence, that in one pilot project they might not pay anything in reference to real wages, and that certainly in another pilot project they might well establish a wage of \$2 an hour?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentlewoman, taking the first part of her question first, that we use the words "gainful employment" of American youths, and "gainful employment" for the purpose of providing gainful employment, and so on, as just one of the purposes of this legislation. It is a conservation bill. We do not mean that giving youngsters remunerative employment is either the sole or most important purpose. We intend this to be a conservation bill and to give the two departments wide latitude in administering the bill and in reaching appropriate rates of compensation. I think if we remove the words "gainful employment" we would make it impossible to effectively carry out the program. Enrollees should be paid for the conservation work they perform, but this rate, consistent with the demonstration characteristics of the bill could vary from project to project, although the wisdom of such might be questioned.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then as I understand the chairman, he is saying that gainful employment does not require a dollar remuneration for every person who is engaged in this program?

Mr. PERKINS. "Gainful employment" may not be on a dollar-per-hour basis. It may be on some other basis taking into account the type of work, the quality of work that the youngsters are engaged in, but we intended youths to have opportunities for gainful employment in the area of conservation in the programs offered.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. So if I understand the gentleman, I fully applaud the goal of my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), and I certainly want the emphasis on this legislation to be on conservation, and that no programs would be involved in this or would be undertaken that were otherwise. That was the primary goal—conservation.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. This is our goal here.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. But do I understand the chairman to say, then, that gainful employment does not necessarily require a dollar remuneration for students who are involved?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. Under that authority of the bill pay of enrollees is not required, but I do not see any enrollee not being compensated under any demonstration project I can now visualize.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. It does not require that?

Mr. PERKINS. It would not absolutely require a dollar remuneration.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. So a Girl Scout organization or a school system could have a rotating program and the emphasis would still be on conservation or cleaning up the forest or building parks, but no pay would be required?

Mr. PERKINS. No pay is absolutely required, but I do not believe that it is contemplated that enrollees will serve without dollar remuneration.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. And they would not have to be paid a salary?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of my Chairman, when we talk about "gainful employment" as is stated in the hearings on page 20, the estimate is that boys and girls will be paid \$80 a month.

If it is based on the figure stated by the gentlewoman from Oregon, it would be \$2 an hour.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that we set out general purposes in the legislation, giving the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture wide latitude, and purposely so, to develop pilot programs. We do not intend to restrict the departments, to make sure that they pay everyone the same. They may pay less for certain types of conservation work. They may have different programs requiring different compensation.

Mr. SCHERLE. If they are going to pay them \$20 a week, of course that is \$80 a month, under what has been stipulated here, and if they are going to pay them on the basis of \$2 an hour, that means that simply all they will work, as gainful employment for pay, is 2 hours a day.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say that this is an estimate. There is no doubt in my mind that there will be variances from the estimate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. If the bill passes, will these new found employees be working on Federal or State lands, or both?

Mr. PERKINS. We provide in the bill that they shall be working on Federal lands, but we further provide that a study shall be made with a report back to the Congress as to how we shall work it out with the States on a State-Federal basis, where we have State parks. All the funds here will go on Federal lands.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentlewoman from Oregon spoke of rotating. Do I correctly understand she suggests these youths be rotated or that the programs be rotated? To what would the rotation apply?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have in mind a program that will be run by a school district, where they would decide they



would take out a group of youngsters between the ages of 16 and 18 or 19, whatever the final age limit is, and that they might have this group out for 30 days at a camp, and then bring those youngsters back and take out another group for the next 30 days. It would not be babysitting or recreation or fun programs. Indeed they would learn about conservation and they would have an opportunity to be out in the national forests. They would do work in terms of cleaning up the parks, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Would not transportation eat up the money very rapidly? This is not intended to benefit the west coast exclusively, is it? Would not transportation costs of rotating on that basis eat up the funds very quickly?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If my friend would yield further, on page 4 I was glad to note that they correct one of the great deficiencies of the Job Corps program, because the gentleman from Washington made certain that to minimize the transportation costs the Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible. If we are going to have only 3,000 youngsters under this pilot program we are not going to be transporting children across the country, as we have done in previous programs.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, the gentlewoman does recognize that there are a lot of empty beer cans to be picked up in this eastern part of the country, too, in various public places.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Any person who had full vision or even partial vision would agree with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman. I see here the start of still another costly program to further socialize this country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On Page 3, line 24, after the semicolon, insert the following:

*"Provided further, no Corps members shall participate in firefighting activities."*

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the assignment of members of the proposed Youth Conservation Corps to firefighting. Forest fires represent a tremendous peril to life, and I do not believe that boys and girls, 14 to 18 years of age or 16 to 18 years of age, for that matter, as the amendment would have it, should be exposed to this peril. The language I am offering would protect them from that danger.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that a very serious accident involving the deaths of seven teenagers took place in Los Angeles County in August 1968. Teenage probationers under the juvenile delinquency program in California had been assigned to fighting brush fires. Let me read from the Los Angeles Times of August 25, 1968:

A scoring blast of fire swept through a funnel-like canyon Saturday and killed seven teenage firefighters and an adult foreman as they battled a huge brush fire in the San Gabriel Mountains.

Mr. Chairman, I simply offer this amendment in order to try to prevent a similar tragedy occurring with respect to the young people under this program.

Thereafter, Los Angeles County prohibited the use of juvenile probationers to fight forest fires, and a bill was introduced in the California Legislature providing that youngsters under the age of 18 could not participate in fire suppression work unless specific conditions were met:

First, that the parent or guardian of the youth give permission for such labor; Second, that the youth receive training equivalent in number of training hours to that received by persons in apprenticeship for firefighting; and third, that all other available manpower is being or has been used.

If the committee desires to offer these conditions as an amendment to my amendment, it would be acceptable to me. Of course, I am sure that it is not necessary to point out that my amendment would not prevent Corps members from taking whatever action is necessary for self protection in an emergency.

It may be argued that under this bill the problem is taken care of because the interagency committee has the power to determine conditions of employment, but I might point out that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior are both responsible for operating Jobs Corps Civilian Conservation Centers, and both departments used members of the Job Corps for forest firefighting. This continued until a regulation was adopted by the Job Corps last year which banned this practice.

This regulation in section 712 of the Civilian Conservation Center Administrative Manual, provides that no youth under the age of 18 can participate in firefighting. Moreover, the Job Corps regulation provides that for youths 18 years of age and older to participate, they must be graduates of a fire suppression training course; they must be volunteers; and they must be paid at standard firefighters' rates.

None of these protections exist in the pending bill, and in view of the reluctance of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture to accept the regulation that was adopted by the Job Corps, it is doubtful that similar regulations would be issued to protect youngsters under this program.

I urge support of this amendment in order to protect prospective Youth Conservation Corps members who otherwise might be assigned to firefighting duty and run the risk of a tragic accident. At the very least, the committee should consider language similar to that which was introduced in the California State Legislature.

Mr. PERKINS, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

I would hate to see the day come in this country when we would enroll youngsters in a conservation program

and then prohibit them from fighting fires.

One of the things that made the CCC boys earn the lasting gratitude of the Nation was their work in fighting forest fires. Insofar as I am concerned this should be one of the functions of the new corps. Youngsters 16, 17, or 18 years of age need to know more about protecting our forests.

If we undertake to tie the hands of these youngsters so that they could not even defend themselves, I think this Congress would be derelict in its responsibility.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman agree with me that under the proposed amendment if members of this new Conservation Corps were in their own camp and a forest fire broke out, they would be prevented from protecting their own camp from that fire?

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly agree with the distinguished author of the bill.

There are certain fundamental things we want to teach children in this country.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think it is probably more dangerous to send them to college today than it would be for them to fight forest fires in the forests.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to say to my colleagues that it will be a sad day when a man goes out in the woods and cannot build a fire trail that is a part of fire fighting or the repairing and taking care of it. I would hate to see the fact that if a dormitory caught fire, they would have to stand there and see it burn. I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MRS. GREEN OF OREGON

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: On page 1, line 4, strike out "gainful." Page 2, line 20, strike out "gainful."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with some of my colleagues and since the chairman of the full committee has already said that in his judgment the legislation would allow the school districts or Girl Scout organizations or Boy Scout organizations to have



programs where there would be no dollar remuneration per hour but that the subsistence and transportation, et cetera, would be the benefits which they would receive, it seems to me would be better in terms of establishing the legislative history to strike out the word "gainful" in both places so that it would be clearly established that the intent of the House was to allow a pilot program where they would receive remuneration—the enrollees involved—at so many dollars an hour, but that they might have another pilot project which might be of a shorter duration with the emphasis still solely on conservation and ecology and yet not pay them an hourly wage. This is the purpose of the amendments and I think requires no further explanation. I would hope that the amendments would be adopted.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with the striking of these two words in these very delicate places, the gentlewoman from Oregon has just turned this from a conservation employment program into an education, bird watching program.

I think that the intent of this legislation, clearly from the outset, was to provide gainful employment in the preservation and conservation of our natural resources and that the primary intent was not provide educational experiences for young people. We gave some ground on the bill earlier, but if we give more ground on this, we will find ourselves right out the window with the original intent and purpose of this bill. However, I thought that the gentlewoman from Oregon supported it when we came in here, but we are going to end up with a program far different than the kind of civilian conservation program which we came in here originally to pass through this body. I would hope the amendment would be defeated.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then I must assume that the gentleman from Washington is in disagreement with the gentleman from Kentucky on what gainful employment means.

Mr. MEEDS. Your assumption is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. All right. This, Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will yield further, is perhaps the reason that the House should exercise its will and decide whether this indeed is a program where every single person must be paid, even though the National Girl Scouts Organization or the public school system of Portland plans 3 or 4 weeks programs with the entire conservation purpose of the bill exclusively in mind; namely, that the emphasis must be on conservation and ecology. I do not want this referred to as just an education program. I want it to be a work program.

However, if my colleagues recall the year-round Job Corps program, with its

conservation campus, was sold on the basis of being patterned after CCC. I have never understood this bill to be another program to be run by the Federal Government and serving the same purpose as the Job Corps conservation camps. CCC programs were year-round programs or 2-year programs with education as a major part of them.

The bill says "up to 90 days." The House just agreed that school districts and established organizations might well have contracts for 4-week projects, for example.

I believe, for many young people, 4 weeks would provide a very valuable experience and I do not believe the Federal Government in all instances must pay every enrollee under all circumstances. They do provide transportation, subsistence, and so forth.

In some cases wages would and should be paid for a 3-month full-time enrollment for 18-year-olds. For 16-year-olds for 1 month—wages may or may not be desirable. Flexibility for pilot programs is essential.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield back my time?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I will, Mr. Chairman and I thank you for yielding.

Mr. MEEDS. I would just like to say that I do not agree with the gentlewoman from Oregon about this. It is my feeling that if we keep going and talking about the Campfire Girls and the Girl Scouts pretty soon we are going to have a program entirely different than what we came in here to pass, and that was to provide a program for young men and women from the ages of 16 to 19 of gainful employment in the conservation of our natural resources during the summer period, and not some program for the Girl Scouts or a school system—although I think some of these can be worked in.

But I would hope we would continue to use the words "gainful employment" so we can continue the effect of this program.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), because she has done nothing more with her amendments than explicitly state what the chairman said the bill contains. And I would urge the Members of the House to vote affirmatively.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN). I certainly regret that we have developed a misunderstanding. It is my judgment that the language in the bill will permit the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior to develop a different scale of pay for various conservation projects. I do not visualize that any circumstance will justify a pilot project for which enrollees will not receive a wage, a salary, or some form of dollar remuneration for the conservation work they perform. Conservation work is valuable to the Nation, and one lesson youth should learn from the program is

that this Nation recognizes its value. Not to pay youngsters for conservation work would negate this concept.

To strike from the bill the concept of gainful employment departs 180 degrees from the direction the author of the bill and the committee took in bringing the bill to the floor. It makes a mockery of our efforts to pattern it from the valuable experience of the CCC program. We want young people to be doing something that enriches the Nation's natural resources. That is in itself a gainful experience. But when we strike the word "gainful" from employment we are just tearing down the concept of great value we assign to protecting the natural resources that we intended to be developed in this pilot program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members in this Chamber to oppose this amendment, because it will destroy the bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am glad the gentlewoman from Oregon offered this amendment because I thought that the meaning of the word "gainful" got awfully confused here for a while.

However, I find that I cannot agree with the amendment because if this program is going to work, you have to permit the young people to earn some money in return for the good work that they do.

I think the organizations that want to develop volunteer effort to clean up the debris in the park lands and to plant some trees in the local park lands, ought to be encouraged to do so. But we should not call upon the Forest Service or the Park Service to become engaged in this type of activity themselves.

I think what this ought to be, now that we have the 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds, is an opportunity for young people who want to get employment for the summer time to be able to do it in conservation work out in the forest which will be for the betterment of the rest of our citizenry and that it should be gainful employment is an important part of it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Let me give you an example. If a school district has a program where they take youngsters out for a month for the exact purposes which the bill has, that is, for conservation purposes; is the gentleman saying that it would be better to require that every youngster be paid so much an hour rather than the funds might be used to take a larger number of youngsters out over a period of time and do the same work?

Would my colleague also agree that by striking out the word "gainful," it does not prohibit the agency that is running it from paying any of the people that they want to pay. They can by leaving the word "employment" in those pilot programs where they want to pay the enrollees so much per hour, they certainly are entitled to do it under the language, even if the amendment were adopted.

But it would allow a little more flexi-



bility so that if there were a program run by a school district, they would not be required in that particular instance and that particular pilot project to reimburse them—beyond providing transportation, housing, and subsistence.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentlewoman that the Forest Service or the Park Service would be about the same way as you and I are if a young college student works for us in the summertime and we do not pay anything for their remuneration.

The more you pay them, the more they are encouraged and you know you only have control over that student if you pay him yourself. That is why I believe we should only ask the Forest Service and the Park Service to be engaged in conservation.

I think if a local school has a program where young people and students go out for 30 days, I think that is great. But I think they ought to work that program themselves and they ought to hire those teachers where they have that program in the summertime themselves.

We have the summer program here of conceivably 3,000 young people who are going to be engaged in it and I think it ought to be more akin to what we had on the old Civilian Conservation Corps. It ought to approximate or be more akin to the kind of work that the 18-, 19-, and 20- and 21-year-olds are doing more in college right now for the Forest Service and the Park Service, to look at this and help conservation and to reduce that age somewhat as they are engaged in those two services at the present time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Does the gentleman want all the programs to be 90-day programs?

Mr. QUIE. I would prefer them to be 90 days, but I am not going to say it has to be that. I think it would work better if they hired students where they spend 90 days in the summertime operating that way and we allow the Forest Service and the Park Service to develop the rates of pay. If they can secure them at a lower rate than the minimum wage, I think that is up to them.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I seldom take the floor to speak on a piece of legislation before the House but I think it is most important that I do so today.

It was my understanding that this legislation was going to be patterned after the Civilian Conservation Corps of the early 1930's.

With this amendment before us it will no longer be patterned after that most excellent organization. I envisioned this as a pilot project that perhaps eventually can become a civilian conservation corps. When that happens, then the legislation passed today, if we pass it without the amendment, will go down in the history of this country as perhaps the best piece of domestic legislation passed by this Congress.

I say that because the legislation passed that made possible the Civilian Conservation Corps is, in my opinion, the best piece of legislation that has ever been passed by the Congress of the United States affecting the domestic situation of our great country.

I say that, my colleagues, because I went to a CCC camp. I can assure you that had I not that opportunity, I would not be a Member of Congress today. I can also assure you that hundreds of men who went to CCC's would not be today the respected citizens of their communities had they also not had the opportunity of going to the Civilian Conservation Camp.

Yes, I remember getting up at 6 o'clock in the morning and going out into the forests to fight forest to build roads, and bridges, plant trees and on occasions fight forest fires. We did the things that were necessary to reforest the land, in our beloved State of California, but others were doing the same thing throughout the country. I remember going to the Civilian Conservation Camp not because I was poor or not because I came from the slums of East Los Angeles, but because the CCC camps were dedicated to the preservation of the forests and the conservation of the land, and this gave us purpose and pride.

It was the pride that I had in being a member of the Civilian Conservation camp that perhaps made it possible for me to acquire a feeling of belonging and of service to my fellow men, a feeling that I still possess as a Member of this Congress. It was the type of leadership, discipline, and organization that was engendered in me that made it possible for me to save from my \$30-a-month pay the money that was necessary to go on to an institution of higher learning.

These are the things that the CCC camps did for me and has done for hundreds of men who are now respected citizens of the United States of America. This is what I believe can happen if we pass the legislation as it was written, for I can envision a program that will become the CCC of this decade.

The one very troublesome aspect of this legislation is that the program provides for only 3,000 young people. I wish it were 3 million. I wish we could take 3 million youngsters from an atmosphere of idleness and put them into the busy atmosphere of the Civilian Conservation Corps. In that way, we would be able to get them out of the trouble that can come in an atmosphere of idleness, that can only lead to the destruction of the human spirit, ending eventually in the correction institutions of our land.

I believe that this is a most important piece of legislation and that it must be enacted by this House without the amendment that is before us at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon.

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15361) to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1063, he reported the bill back

to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 255, nays 54, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—255

Abbitt	Dwyer	Langen
Abernethy	Edmondson	Latta
Adair	Edwards, Calif.	Leggett
Adams	Edwards, La.	Lennon
Albert	Eilberg	Lloyd
Alexander	Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.
Anderson,	Feighan	Lowenstein
Calif.	Flood	Lujan
Anderson, Ill.	Flowers	McCloskey
Anderson,	Foley	McClure
Tenn.	Ford,	McCulloch
Andrews,	William D.	McDade
N. Dak.	Fountain	McFall
Annunzio	Fraser	McKneally
Aspinall	Frelinghuysen	Macdonald,
Ayres	Friedel	Mass.
Beall, Md.	Fulton, Pa.	MacGregor
Bell, Calif.	Fulton, Tenn.	Mahon
Bennett	Fuqua	Mailliard
Biester	Galifianakis	Marsh
Bingham	Gallagher	Matsunaga
Blanton	Garmatz	May
Blatnik	Gettys	Meeds
Boggs	Glaimo	Mikva
Boland	Gibbons	Miller, Calif.
Bolling	Gonzalez	Miller, Ohio
Bray	Gray	Mills
Brooks	Green, Oreg.	Minish
Brotzman	Griffiths	Mink
Brown, Calif.	Grover	Mizell
Brown, Ohio	Gubser	Monagan
Broyhill, N.C.	Gude	Montgomery
Broyhill, Va.	Hanley	Moorhead
Burke, Mass.	Hanna	Morgan
Burlison, Mo.	Hansen, Idaho	Morse
Burton, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.	Morton
Button	Harsha	Mosher
Byrnes, Wis.	Hawkins	Moss
Caffery	Hechler, W. Va.	Murphy, Ill.
Carter	Heckler, Mass.	Myers
Casey	Helstoski	Natcher
Celler	Henderson	Nelsen
Chamberlain	Hicks	Nichols
Chappell	Hogan	Obey
Clark	Holifield	O'Hara
Clausen,	Hosmer	O'Konski
Don H.	Howard	Olsen
Clay	Hungate	O'Neill, Mass.
Cleveland	Ichord	Patman
Cohelan	Jarman	Patten
Collier	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Perkins
Corbett	Jonas	Pettis
Coughlin	Jones, Ala.	Philbin
Culver	Jones, N.C.	Pickle
Daniel, Va.	Jones, Tenn.	Pike
de la Garza	Karth	Pirnie
Dennis	Kastenmeier	Poage
Derwinski	Kazen	Poff
Donohue	Kee	Preyer, N.C.
Dorn	Keith	Price, Ill.
Downing	Kluczynski	Pryor, Ark.
Dulski	Koch	Pucinski
Duncan	Kuykendall	Purcell



Quie	Sikes	Ullman
Railsback	Sisk	Van Deerlin
Randall	Slack	Vander Jagt
Rees	Smith, Calif.	Vanik
Reuss	Smith, Iowa	Waggonner
Rhodes	Snyder	Waldie
Roberts	Springer	Wampler
Robison	Stafford	Watts
Rodino	Staggers	Whalen
Rogers, Colo.	Stanton	White
Rogers, Fla.	Stephens	Whitehurst
Rooney, Pa.	Stokes	Widnall
Rosenthal	Stubblefield	Wiggins
Rostenkowski	Stuckey	Williams
Roth	Sullivan	Wilson, Bob
Roybal	Symington	Wright
Ryan	Talcott	Wyatt
Sandman	Taylor	Wyman
Satterfield	Teague, Calif.	Yates
Saylor	Thompson, N.J.	Young
Sebelius	Thomson, Wis.	Zablocki
Shipley	Tiernan	Zion
Shriver	Udall	Zwach

## NAYS—54

Andrews, Ala.	Devine	Martin
Arends	Dickinson	Mayne
Ashbrook	Eshleman	Michel
Belcher	Fisher	Mize
Betts	Flynt	Price, Tex.
Bow	Foreman	Quillen
Brinkley	Frey	Reid, Ill.
Buchanan	Goodling	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Griffin	Scott
Burleson, Tex.	Gross	Skubitz
Camp	Haley	Smith, N.Y.
Clancy	Hall	Steiger, Wis.
Clawson, Del.	Hull	Teague, Tex.
Collins	Kleppe	Vigorito
Colmer	Kyl	Whalley
Crane	Landgrebe	Winn
Davis, Wis.	Lukens	Wold
Denney	Mann	Wylie

## NOT VOTING—120

Addabbo	Fallon	Mollohan
Ashley	Farbstein	Murphy, N.Y.
Baring	Fascell	Nedzi
Barrett	Findley	Nix
Berry	Fish	O'Neal, Ga.
Bevill	Ford, Gerald R.	Ottinger
Biaggi	Gaydos	Passman
Blackburn	Gilbert	Pelly
Brademas	Goldwater	Podell
Brasco	Green, Pa.	Pollock
Brock	Hagan	Powell
Broomfield	Halpern	Rarick
Brown, Mich.	Hamilton	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Utah	Hammer-	Reifel
Bush	schmidt	Riegle
Byrne, Pa.	Harrington	Rivers
Cabell	Harvey	Roe
Carey	Hastings	Rooney, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hathaway	Roudebush
Chisholm	Hays	Ruppe
Conable	Hébert	Ruth
Conyers	Horton	St Germain
Corman	Hunt	Schadeberg
Cowger	Hutchinson	Scheuer
Cramer	Jacobs	Schneebeli
Cunningham	King	Schwengel
Daddario	Kirwan	Steed
Daniels, N.J.	Kyros	Steiger, Ariz.
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Stratton
Dawson	Long, La.	Taft
Delaney	McCarthy	Thompson, Ga.
Dellenback	McClory	Tunney
Dent	McDonald,	Watkins
Diggs	Mich.	Watson
Dingell	McEwen	Weicker
Dowdy	McMillan	Whitten
Eckhardt	Madden	Wilson
Edwards, Ala.	Mathias	Charles H.
Erlenborn	Micher	Wolff
Esch	Meskill	Wylder
Evins, Tenn.	Minshall	Yatron

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Watson.  
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Weicker.  
 Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Hunt.  
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. Melcher with Mr. Broomfield.  
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.  
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Schadeberg.  
 Mr. Carey with Mr. McEwen.  
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Berry.  
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Pollock.  
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Reid of New York.  
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Taft.  
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Hastings.  
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Cederberg.  
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Horton.  
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Cowger.  
 Mr. Podell with Mr. Brock.  
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Watkins.  
 Mr. Roe with Mr. McClory.  
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Findley.  
 Mr. Wolff with Mr. Minshall.  
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Dawson.  
 Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Esch.  
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Dellenback.  
 Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.  
 Mr. Conyers with Mr. McCarthy.  
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Powell.  
 Mr. Kirwan with Mrs. Chisholm.  
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Ottinger.  
 Mr. Cabell with Mr. Bush.  
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.  
 Mr. Bevill with Mr. Schwengel.  
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harvey.  
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Roudebush.  
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Goldwater.  
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hutchin-

son.  
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Schneebeli.  
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Cunningham.  
 Mr. Fascell with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
 Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Erlenborn.  
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Reifel.  
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Hammerschmidt.  
 Mr. Kyros with Mr. Brown of Michigan.  
 Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Roth.  
 Mr. Nedzi with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Mathias.  
 Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Ruppe.  
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Pelly.  
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Hagan with Mr. Jacobs.  
 Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. King.  
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Wylder.  
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Cramer.  
 Mr. Riegle with Mr. Conable.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1063, the Committee on Education and Labor is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERKINS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1076 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 15361, as passed, as follows:

## "POLICY AND PURPOSE

"SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth, representing all segments of society, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas creates an opportunity for understanding

and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of natural resources of the United States by the youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

"SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corps'). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ during the summer months without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary.

"(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

## "SECRETARIAL DUTIES

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall:

"(1) designate the public lands upon which members of the Corps can be effectively utilized in conservation work, and coordinate Corps efforts with those holding jurisdiction over the respective public lands;

"(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

"(3) arrange directly or by contract with any public agency or organization or any private non profit agency or organization which has been in existence for five years for transportation, lodging, subsistence, other services and equipment for the needs of members of the Corps in fulfilling their duties: *Provided*, That whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities (including abandoned military installations) shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps, *And provided further*, That to minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

"(4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members;

"(5) Prepare a report, indicating the most efficient method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

"(b) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support staff.

## "SECRETARIAL REPORTS

"SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted



to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

#### "AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

"SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 15361) was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call 162 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S NONEXISTENT HOUSING MESSAGE

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, a White House spokesman admitted the President of the United States "goofed" when he attacked the Congress on the so-called Emergency Home Financing Act.

I regret that the President, himself, has not seen fit to personally admit his errors of fact uttered in a Friday afternoon press conference.

At that time, the President said:

Ladies and gentlemen, on Feb. 2, I sent to the Congress a message asking for enactment of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. You will note that I described this as the "Emergency" Home Finance Act of 1970.

Four months have passed and the Congress has yet failed to act.

In presenting Secretary Romney to you today, I should point out that he recommended to me four months ago that this legislation be sent to the Congress. It is time to act. Secretary Romney has talked to me on several occasions since Feb. 2, urging action.

The truth is, of course, that the President was talking about a nonexistent

Presidential message. He even purported to quote from this nonexistent message.

The only thing that happened on housing on February 2 was the opening of hearings in the House Banking and Currency Committee. And this session was called the "Emergency Home Financing Hearings" and they were launched because the President and the administration had failed to come up with anything—not one item—to deal with the crisis in home financing. The hearings were designed to overcome the administration's massive apathy about housing.

Those of us on the Banking and Currency Committee would have been delighted if we had had a Presidential message of support for home financing on February 2. But we had no message of any kind and if the administration was talking about an "Emergency Home Financing Act" it kept this fact a deep secret.

Yet the President on Friday afternoon had the temerity to stand up before the Nation's press, the television cameras and the radio microphones and say:

I sent to the Congress on Feb. 2 a message asking for enactment of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970.

Unfortunately, the major news programs that night—on the Columbia Broadcasting System, the National Broadcasting Co. and the American Broadcasting Co.—carried film clips and tapes from that press conference. In each news segment the President was talking about his February 2 message—the nonexistent message—and repeatedly he claimed that "4 months have passed" since the message. On and on the claims went and I am sure before the night was over, millions of American people were convinced that the Congress was delaying on something that the President had sent it in February.

The next day many of the major newspapers around the Nation accepted the President's statement at face value. Front page stories were printed claiming the Congress had delayed 4 months on a nonexistent message.

On Sunday, the Washington Evening Star, in a story under the byline of Shirley Elder, printed the real facts—the fact that no such Presidential message existed. The Washington Evening Star took the trouble to ask the White House for a copy of the message which the President touted so long and so loud Friday afternoon.

The White House obviously could not produce a nonexistent message and as the Evening Star reports, "somebody goofed."

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful that we have a Washington Evening Star. I place in the RECORD a copy of the article by Shirley Elder:

#### "SOMEBODY GOOFED" ON HOUSING DRAFT (By Shirley Elder)

President Nixon is in the awkward position of having denounced the Democratic-controlled Congress for failing to act on an administration housing proposal that never existed.

On Friday, Nixon, with HUD Secretary George Romney at his side, told reporters at the White House:

"Ladies and gentlemen, on Feb. 2, I sent to the Congress a message asking for enact-

ment of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. You will note that I described this as the 'Emergency' Home Finance Act of 1970.

"Four months have passed and the Congress has yet failed to act . . .

"In presenting Secretary Romney to you today, I should point out that he recommended to me four months ago that this legislation be sent to the Congress . . . It is time to act. Secretary Romney has talked to me on several occasions since Feb. 2, urging action."

As one White House aide reluctantly conceded yesterday, "somebody goofed."

There was no White House message to Congress on Feb. 2, urging enactment of an emergency housing bill. There was a budget message. It touched briefly on housing, pointing to a need for 600,000 new units. It said nothing about specific legislation.

The House Banking and Currency Committee did begin hearings Feb. 2 on legislation designed to boost the housing industry but no administration position was offered. A spokesman for the committee said Romney, head of the Housing and Urban Development Department, was invited to present a White House view, but was unable to attend a session until Feb. 24.

At that time, Romney still could offer no definite legislative plan. Romney spoke convincingly of the need for housing and the problems, mostly because of the high cost of money.

The housing secretary told the committee that "legislation is being prepared" to provide government support of the mortgage market and to strengthen lending institutions. He did not say when the legislation would be ready.

On March 5, the first administration proposal, for a \$250 million subsidy to savings and loans associations from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, was introduced in the House by Banking Committee Chairman Wright Patman of Texas and the committee's top Republican, Rep. William Widnall of New Jersey. The idea originally had been outlined by Bank Board Chairman Preston Martin.

On March 6, Senate Housing Subcommittee Chairman John Sparkman of Alabama co-sponsored with Sen. Wallace F. Bennett, R-Utah, a similar bill—aimed at reducing interest rates—and hearings began in the Senate.

Although the housing situation generally was referred to as critical and the necessary action considered an emergency, nothing was formally called the "Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970" until the Senate committee polished up a final version of the bill April 7 in what was described as a bipartisan effort.

On April 16, the Senate passed the bill 72 to 0. In its final form, the measure would make up to \$10 billion available for the sagging housing market. Included was a plan by Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., to help middle-income families buy homes.

In addition to the \$250 million interest rate subsidy on home mortgages, the Senate bill also would reallocate about \$2 billion of unused funds from the Government National Mortgage Association to support FHA and VA loans.

On April 28, for the first time, a HUD official let it be known that the administration was in favor of the Senate bill.

#### PATMAN IS CHIDED

In a letter to Patman, HUD Undersecretary Richard C. Van Dusen urged swift House action. On the same day, Widnall introduced his own bill, identical to the Senate version, and chided Patman for delaying a vote.

On April 29, Rep. William A. Barrett, D-Pa., chairman of the housing subcommittee, noted the Senate bill had only two sections dealing immediately with the mortgage crisis—the \$250 million subsidy and the









# ESTABLISHMENT OF A PILOT PROGRAM DESIGNATED AS THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1076.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

## POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth, representing all segments of society, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of natural resources of the United States by the youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

## YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps — (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ during the summer months without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary.

(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

## SECRETARIAL DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall:

(1) designate the public lands upon which members of the Corps can be effectively utilized in conservation work, and coordinate Corps efforts with those holding jurisdiction over the respective public lands;

(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: Provided, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) arrange directly or by contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for five years for transportation, lodging, subsistence, other services and equipment for the needs of members of the Corps in fulfilling their duties: Provided, That whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities (including abandoned military installations) shall be utilized for the pur-

poses of the Corps, and provided further, That to minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

(4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members;

(5) prepare a report, indicating the most efficient method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

(b) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support staff.

## SECRETARIAL REPORTS

SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

## AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House on S. 1076 and ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. CRANSTON) appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. STEVENS, conferees on the part of the Senate.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the pending bill. I will not discuss it tonight. The amendment would cut back the base appropriations to the House levels. It would be a reduction of about \$122 million.

I will call up the amendment tomorrow and discuss it at that time and ask for a rollcall vote on tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

## ANSWER TO CRITICISM OF THE VICE PRESIDENT BY MR. BERNARD SEGAL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, Vice President AGNEW has been unfairly criticized by Mr. Bernard Segal, president of the American Bar Association.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an answer by the Vice President to the criticism of Mr. Segal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. Bernard Segal, President of the American Bar Association, has stated that my recent criticism of remarks made by Mr. Joseph Rhodes shows that I am inconsistent about dissent.

Mr. Segal is apparently confused about the thrust of my criticism. It had nothing to do with Mr. Rhodes' right to dissent as a private citizen, but rather dealt with the basic requirement that, in fairness, fact-finding investigations do not properly begin with a recitation of unsubstantiated opinion by the investigators.

Mr. Rhodes, among other visceral comments, stated: "Governor Reagan was bent on killing people for his own political gain." This pronouncement is immature and ridiculous for Rhodes the citizen to make, but it is within his right of dissent. But for Rhodes, the Federal commissioned investigator, to make such a gratuitous observation to the press about the most visible symbol of establishment resistance against student violence is outrageous and, more important, disqualifying because it shows a transparent bias and a closed mind on the subject matter under examination.

Before the Commission was even organized, member Rhodes had allowed his emotions to indict and condemn Governor Reagan without even a rudimentary investigation of the facts.

It is frankly surprising that I have to make this distinction clear to the President of the American Bar Association, of all people. He should know that there can be no justice in a determination made by those who have made their decisions before the evidence is received. Mr. Rhodes' sour-stomached statement was not a disagreement based on fact, but a hare-brained unprovable bluster.

## PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that when the pending appropriations bill is disposed of, the next item to be taken up will be the agricultural appropriations bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is the intention of the majority leader, as I understand it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know now at what time the agricultural appropriations bill will come up? Certain Senators want to be notified so that they can be present.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is the best judgment of the leadership at the present time that there are at least five known amendments to the pending bill. So, upon that basis I would hope that we could finish the pending business some time in the middle of tomorrow af-



ternoon. I am sure that the majority leader would want to begin the agricultural appropriations bill on tomorrow afternoon. The majority leader will be back the first thing in the morning. And we can respond at that time. I would hope that we could begin on the agricultural appropriations bill tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is to be recognized for an hour tomorrow morning.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

---

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourn, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HATFIELD AT 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the reading of the Journal on tomorrow, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it will then be the intention after the distinguished Senator from Oregon has completed, to have a short morning hour, the time to be limited to 3 minutes, and then to get started on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin as close to 12:30 as possible.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 7, 1970, at 11 a.m.

---

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 6, 1970.

##### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr., of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, vice Arnold R. Weber.

##### OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Darrell M. Trent, of Kansas, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, vice Fred J. Russell.









Rep. Erlenborn discussed the authority of the proposed Environmental Protection Agency and Rep. Pelly noted the advantages of having a single organization responsible for managing pollution control programs. pp. H6528, H6548-9

7. FARM PAYMENTS. Rep. Conte and Rep. Madden expressed support of the Senate action in limiting farm payments, and Rep. Price stated his opposition to the limitation. pp. H6510-1, H6555-6, E6465
8. PESTICIDES. Rep. Monagan criticized USDA's enforcement of pesticides regulations, particularly its lack of action to restrict the use of mercurial pesticides compounds, many of whose reregistration had been objected to by HEW as potential human health hazards. pp. H6559-60
9. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. Insisted on its amendment to S. 1076, establishing a pilot program, and appointed conferees. p. H6520
10. POSTAL REFORM. Disagreed to the Senate amendment to HR 17070, the postal reform bill, and appointed conferees. pp. H6520-23
11. PERSONNEL. Passed HR 16968, adjusting the Government contribution to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants. pp. H6529-44
12. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. McMillan stated that nothing in HR 16920, regarding the restriction of textile imports, would jeopardize the export of tobacco and the U.S. tobacco industry. pp. H6545-6
13. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Patman noted the concern of various individuals about the rising interest rates and discussed the structure of the Federal Reserve bank system. pp. H6574-7
14. ADJOURNED until Monday, July 13. p. H6587

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

15. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Schwengel praised an essay urging support and continuation of the rural electric cooperatives program. p. E6469
16. ENVIRONMENT. Rep. Erlenborn urged establishment of a National Environmental Center. p. E6469
17. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Berry called attention to a statement which noted that "prices on products that are 'protected' by import quotas have lagged distinctly behind average prices". pp. E6475-6

BILLS INTRODUCED

18. TAXATION. H.R. 18392, by Rep. Byrnes, to provide more equitable tax treatment for export income; to the Committee on Ways and Means. Remarks of author p. H6578

H.R. 18396, by Rep. Pucinski, to exclude from gross income the first \$500 of interest received from savings account deposits in lending institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

19. PERSONNEL. H.R. 18403, by Rep. Udall, to implement the pay comparability system for Federal employees, to establish a permanent advisory Commission on Federal Pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
20. MEAT INSPECTION. H. Con. Res. 676, by Rep. Langen, to establish a joint congressional committee to carry out a study and investigation of the Federal Meat Inspection Act; to the Committee on Rules. Remarks of author p. E6465

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

21. WALLA WALLA PROJECT. S. 743, authorizing funds to construct the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington. Approved July 7, 1970. (Public Law 91-307)
22. RECREATION. S. 2315, to continue in effect the unified system of annual and user fees for Federal recreation areas (golden eagle program). Approved July 7, 1970 (Public Law 91-308)
23. TARIFFS; L-DOPA. H.R. 8512, to suspend for 2 years the import duty on L-Dopa. Approved July 7, 1970 (Public Law 91-309)
24. LANDS. S. 2062, to differentiate between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage-limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law. Approved July 7, 1970 (Public Law 91-310)

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:

JULY 10: Add lands to Carson National Forest, S. Interior  
Tariff and trade proposals, H. Ways and Means (exec.)

JULY 13 & 14: Watershed projects, H. Agriculture (Williams, SCS, to testify)

-oOo-



The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Nedzi against.

Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Reifel for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Podell against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Mr. Denney for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Cramer for with Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Pepper against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bell of California.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the previous question has been ordered on my motion to go to conference, I ask unanimous consent that there now be 1 hour of debate, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) who has announced that he will propose a motion to instruct the conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RIEGLE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RIEGLE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 15628 be instructed to agree to that part of Senate amendment numbered 3 designated as section 7.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in the event a motion to table the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) is not made, and there is an hour's debate on the motion, who will control the time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) will control the time.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to table.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS moves to lay on the table the motion offered by Mr. RIEGLE.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been prevailed upon to attempt to withdraw my motion on the understanding that there will be some equal division of time, and if it is not too late I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 153, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

#### YEAS—237

Abbott	Duncan	MacGregor
Abernethy	Edmondson	Mahon
Adair	Edwards, Ala.	Mailliard
Albert	Erlenborn	Mann
Anderson,	Eshleman	Marsh
Tenn.	Evins, Tenn.	Martin
Andrews, Ala.	Fallon	Mathias
Arends	Feighan	May
Ashbrook	Fisher	Mayne
Ayres	Flood	Michel
Baring	Flowers	Miller, Calif.
Beall, Md.	Flynt	Mills
Belcher	Ford, Gerald R.	Minshall
Bennett	Foreman	Mize
Berry	Fountain	Mizell
Betts	Frelinghuysen	Mollohan
Bevill	Frey	Montgomery
Blackburn	Fuqua	Morgan
Blanton	Goldwater	Murphy, Ill.
Boggs	Goodling	Murphy, N.Y.
Bolling	Gray	Myers
Bow	Green, Oreg.	Natcher
Bray	Griffin	Nelsen
Brinkley	Gross	Nichols
Brock	Grover	O'Neal, Ga.
Brooks	Hagan	Passman
Brotzman	Haley	Patman
Brown, Mich.	Hall	Pelly
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-	Perkins
Broyhill, N.C.	schmidt	Pettis
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Pickle
Buchanan	Harsha	Pike
Burke, Fla.	Harvey	Pirnie
Burleson, Tex.	Hastings	Poage
Burton, Utah	Hays	Poff
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Price, Tex.
Cabell	Henderson	Purcell
Camp	Hogan	Quie
Carter	Hosmer	Quillen
Casey	Hull	Railsback
Cederberg	Hunt	Randall
Chamberlain	Hutchinson	Reid, Ill.
Chappell	Ichord	Rhodes
Clancy	Jarman	Rivers
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Roberts
Clausen,	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Don H.	Jones, Ala.	Roth
Clawson, Del	Jones, N.C.	Roudebush
Cleveland	Jones, Tenn.	Rousselot
Collier	Kazen	Ruth
Collins	Kee	Sandman
Colmer	King	Satterfield
Conable	Kleppe	Schadeberg
Corbett	Kluczynski	Scherle
Cowger	Kuykendall	Schmitz
Crane	Kyl	Scott
Cunningham	Landgrebe	Sebelius
Daniel, Va.	Landrum	Shriver
Davis, Ga.	Langen	Sikes
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Skubitz
de la Garza	Lennon	Slack
Delaney	Lloyd	Smith, Calif.
Dennis	Lujan	Snyder
Dent	Lukens	Springer
Derwinski	McClure	Staggers
Dickinson	McCulloch	Steed
Dorn	McClory	Steiger, Ariz.
Dowdy	McFall	Steiger, Wis.
Downing	McKneally	Stephens
Dulski	McMillan	Stratton

Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Taft  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Vander Jagt  
Waggonner

Wampler  
Watkins  
Watson  
Watts  
Whalley  
White  
Whitehurst  
Wiggins  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob

Winn  
Wold  
Wright  
Wyder  
Wyllie  
Wyman  
Young  
Zablocki  
Zion  
Zwach

#### NAYS—153

Adams	Garmatz	O'Konski
Addabbo	Gaydos	Olsen
Alexander	Giambo	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson,	Gibbons	Ottinger
Calif.	Gilbert	Patten
Annunzio	Gonzalez	Philbin
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Preyer, N.C.
Barrett	Griffiths	Price, Ill.
Biaggi	Gude	Pucinski
Biester	Haipern	Rees
Bingham	Hamilton	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hanley	Reuss
Boland	Hanna	Riegle
Brademas	Harrington	Robison
Brasco	Hathaway	Rodino
Burke, Mass.	Hawkins	Roe
Burkison, Mo.	Hechler, W. Va.	Rooney, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.
Button	Helstoski	Rosenthal
Byrne, Pa.	Hicks	Rostenkowski
Celler	Horton	Roybal
Chisholm	Howard	Ruppe
Clay	Hungate	Ryan
Cohelan	Jacobs	St Germain
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Scheuer
Conyers	Karsh	Schneebeli
Corman	Kastenmeier	Schwengel
Coughlin	Keith	Smith, Iowa
Culver	Koch	Smith, N.Y.
Daddario	Kyros	Stafford
Daniels, N.J.	Long, Md.	Stanton
Dellenback	Lowenstein	Stokes
Diggs	McCarthy	Sullivan
Dingell	McCloskey	Symington
Donohue	McDade	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	Macdonald,	Tiernan
Eckhardt	Mass.	Tunney
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Udall
Eilberg	Madsunaga	Ullman
Esch	Meets	Van Deerlin
Evans, Colo.	Melcher	Vanik
Farbstein	Mikva	Vigorito
Fascell	Miller, Ohio	Waldie
Fish	Minish	Weicker
Foley	Mink	Whalen
Ford,	Monagan	Widnall
William D.	Moorhead	Wolff
Fraser	Morse	Wyatt
Friedel	Mosher	Yates
Fulton, Pa.	Moss	Yatron
Fulton, Tenn.	Nix	
Galifianakis	Obey	
Gallagher	O'Hara	

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gubser

#### NOT VOTING—40

Anderson, Ill.	Findley	Pollock
Andrews,	Gettys	Powell
N. Dak.	Hansen, Wash.	Pryor, Ark.
Aspinall	Hollifield	Rarick
Bell, Calif.	Kirwan	Reifel
Broomfield	Leggett	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Calif.	Long, La.	Saylor
Bush	McDonald,	Shipley
Caffery	Mich.	Sisk
Carey	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	Meskill	Whitten
Dawson	Morton	Wilson,
Denney	Nedzi	Charles H.
Devine	Pepper	
Edwards, La.	Podell	

So the motion to table was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reifel for, with Mr. Gubser against.  
Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Aspinall against.  
Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Shipley against.  
Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Pepper against.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Nedzi against.  
Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Podell against.  
Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Dawson against.  
Mr. Denney for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Brown of California against.



Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Bell of California for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Bush for, with Mr. Kirwan against.  
Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Saylor against.  
Mr. Pollock for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Findley.  
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Rogers of Colorado.  
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. REIFEL). If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, HAYS, ADAIR, and MAILLIARD.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1076, YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist upon the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, DANIELS of New Jersey, O'HARA, HATHAWAY, WILLIAM D. FORD, MEEDS, BURTON of California, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Messrs. HAWKINS, GAYDOS, SCHERLE, QUIE, ESCH, STEIGER of Wisconsin, ERLBORN, ESHLEMAN, and COLLINS.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD upon the military sales bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 17070, POSTAL REORGANIZATION AND SALARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 17070) to improve and modernize the postal service, to reorganize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate

amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), the chairman of our committee—I take this time to advise the House that I shall seek recognition to make a motion to instruct the conferees in respect to the language in the House-passed bill guaranteeing to postal employees their right to join or refrain from joining labor unions. We had extensive debate on this issue when H.R. 17070 was before the House on June 17, and at the conclusion of that debate, the house voted overwhelmingly, 179-95, to write into the bill the following language:

Each employee of the Postal Service has the right freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join or assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right.

Despite obvious attempts to create a smokescreen and to suggest that the original bill does not change existing law regarding compulsory unionism, I want to make the point once again that under existing law, including Executive orders which have the force and effect of law, there is no way a union shop can come into existence in the Federal service. Under the provisions of the Senate version of H.R. 17070, the Postal Authority and the unions could negotiate a union shop, or a union shop could be brought into existence through binding arbitration. This would mean that a long-time, efficient career employee could be faced with the choice of joining a union or losing his job. Let me make it clear that we are not arguing here for a National right to work law. We are not arguing for an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act. We are simply saying that every American citizen should have the right to work for his Government without being compelled to join a labor union. I do not believe that the majority of the American people want us to enact a law which can result in making competent, efficient postal employees choose between joining a union against their will or losing their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this position has been editorially supported by leading newspapers throughout the Nation including the Washington Evening Star, the New York Times, the New York Daily News, the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Lancaster, Pa., New Era, the Macon, Ga., News, the Phoenix Republic, the Chicago Daily News, the Dallas Times-Herald, the Newark Evening News, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Philadelphia Bulletin, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the Baltimore Sun, the Worcester, Mass., Telegram, the Goldsboro, N.C., News-Argus, the Chicago Tribune, and many, many others. I urge my colleagues to protect the traditional freedom of all Federal employees to join or refrain from joining a labor organization.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And the vote by which the House expressed its support for the freedom of choice amendment was taken only 3 weeks ago, and by a margin of approximately 2 to 1 the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina was adopted; is that true?

Mr. HENDERSON. The exact vote was 179 to 95.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, is it the intention of the chairman to move to table the motion to be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Definitely.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I first commend the chairman for being consistent in his principles and consistent with the position he has previously taken.

Recognizing the parliamentary complications, may I point out to the Members that we want to go to conference on postal reform and the only way we can get this right-to-work labor issue out of the way is to instruct the House conferees in such a way as to eliminate it from consideration in conference. Therefore in the interest of postal reform we should support the gentleman from North Carolina.

May I say that the postal unions are not at all upset by this development. They primarily want a pay raise. Most postal workers are union members, so this is an academic issue with them.

The Postmaster General is rather disturbed that the right-to-work issue, actually complicated postal reform. We can remove this issue once and for all by instructing the conferees and then we can proceed to write a proper postal reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI)?

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HENDERSON

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HENDERSON moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 17070, be instructed to insist on the provision beginning on page 32, line 6, which reads as follows:

"(b) Each employee of the Postal Service has the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join, and assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right."









July 22, 1970

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ACTION.  
Voted to report (but did not actually report) HR 18546, the general farm bill. Committee received permission to file the report by midnight, Friday, July 24 . p. D802  
Instructed Rep. Poage to introduce a food stamp bill, HR 18582, a summary of which is included in the Record. pp. H7063, H7074  
Reported HR 13543, with amendment, establishing a wheat research and promotion program (H. Rept. No. 91-1322). p. H7074
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on HR 17619, the FY 71 Interior appropriation bill. This bill now goes to the President. pp. H7036-44, S11930-6
3. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. Conferees agreed to file a report on S. 1076, establishing a 3-year pilot Youth Conservation Corps program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. p. D805
4. SYMBOL. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee approved for full committee action S. 3838, preventing the unauthorized manufacture and use of the antilitter symbol "Johnny Horizon". p. D804
5. SEN. HOLLAND. Rep. Haley joined in an expression of appreciation to Sen. Holland by the Board of Directors of the Peace River Electric Cooperative. p. H7035

SENATE

6. ENVIRONMENT. The Committees on Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works filed joint report on SJ Res 207, to establish a Joint Committee on the Environment, recommending enactment with amendments (S. Rept. 91-1033). pp. S11889-90
7. SALARY COMPARABILITY. Both Houses received letter from Chairman, Civil Service Commission, transmitting draft of proposed Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1970. pp. S11889, H7074
8. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Javits placed in the Record the text of his report to the Joint Economic Committee, "Danger of a Trade War Looms Over U.S. International Economic Policy". pp. S11901-3
9. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Javits praised the report of the National Goals Research Staff and submitted the summary report for insertion in the Record. Chapter 2 of the report deals with population growth and distribution, suggesting rural development as an alternative to urban sprawl. pp. S11884-7

# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of July 22, 1970  
91st-2nd; No. 124

### CONTENTS

Agriculture Committee	Foreign trade.....8	Recreation.....16
Action.....1	Horses.....12	Rural Development.....9
Apples.....14	Joint Committee on	Salary comparability.....7
Appropriations.....2	the Environment.....8	Sen. Holland.....5
Civil Service Commission.7	Joint Economic Committee...8	Slaughtering.....15
Environment.....6	Marketing Orders.....14	Symbol.....4
Farm bill.....1	National Goals Research	Water Resources.....10
Fish & Wildlife.....16	Staff.....9	Wheat.....1
Food stamp.....1,11	Personnel.....13	Youth Conservation Corps..3

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee voted to report (but did not actually report) farm bill.  
Both Houses agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill.  
Conferees agreed to file report on Youth Conservation Corps bill.  
Rep. Poage introduced and summarized food stamp bill.



## Joint Committee Meetings

### NATIONAL ECONOMY

*Joint Economic Committee:* Committee continued hearings to review the present state of the national economy, receiving testimony from Prof. Gardner Ackley, University of Michigan; Prof. Paul Samuelson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Prof. Henry Wallich, Yale University.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

*Conferees*, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of S. 1076, to establish a 3-year pilot Youth Conservation Corps program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture.

As approved by the conferees, the bill would: (1) authorize appropriations of \$3,500,000 annually for 3 years following enactment of this act; and (2) provide summer employment on the public lands for young men and women who have attained age 15 but have not attained age 19.

### FOREIGN MILITARY SALES

*Conferees* met in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 15628, relating to the establishment of ceilings for foreign military sales, but did not reach final agreement and recessed subject to call.

### POSTAL REORGANIZATION

*Conferees* continued in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 17070, proposed Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act, but did not reach final agreement and will meet again tomorrow.

## BILLS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

### New Laws

(For last listing of public laws, see DIGEST, p. D788, July 20, 1970)

S. 1455, to expand marketing order authority to apples produced in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio. Signed July 18, 1970 (P.L. 91-341).

S. 3592, to permit custom livestock slaughtering by retail slaughtering houses and to prescribe certain requirements pertaining to such dual operations. Signed July 18, 1970 (P.L. 91-342).

S. 3508, to authorize Federal assistance for land utilization programs to promote fish, wildlife, and recreation development. Signed July 18, 1970 (P.L. 91-343).

S.J. Res. 201, extending from January 1, 1971, until July 1, 1972, the reporting date of the National Commission on Consumer Finance. Signed July 20, 1970 (P.L. 91-344).

S. 1519, to establish an independent agency to be known as the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Signed July 20, 1970 (P.L. 91-345).

S. 3215, making permanent the authorization for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Signed July 20, 1970 (P.L. 91-346).

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 23

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

### Senate

*Committee on Appropriations*, subcommittee, to begin hearings on H.R. 17755, fiscal 1971 appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies, 10 a.m., 1114 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Banking and Currency*, Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, to continue hearings on housing and urban development legislation (S. 3639, 3640, 3775, 3938, and related bills), 10 a.m., 5302 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Commerce*, Subcommittee for Consumers, to hold hearings on the nutritional content of dry breakfast cereals and the related advertising practices of cereal manufacturers, 9:30 a.m., 5110 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Finance*, to continue hearings on H.R. 16311, proposed Family Assistance Act of 1970, 10 a.m., 2221 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs*, Subcommittee on Public Lands, to hold hearings on S. 3389, to provide for the protection, development, and enhancement of the recreation values of the public lands, 10 a.m., 3110 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on the Judiciary*, Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, executive, to consider the following proposed amendments to the Constitution: S.J. Res. 52 and 56, to provide representation in Congress for the District of Columbia; S.J. Res. 61, to provide that equality of rights shall not be denied because of sex; and S.J. Res. 147, to reduce the voting age from 21 to 18 years, 10:30 a.m., 2300 New Senate Office Building.

Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, to continue hearings on S. 3671, to provide for the trial of unfair labor practice cases in the U.S. district courts, 10 a.m., 2228 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*, executive, on committee business, 10 a.m., 4232 New Senate Office Building.

*Committee on Public Works*, Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, executive, to resume consideration of pending air pollution control legislation (S. 3229, 3466, and 3546), 2 p.m., 4200 New Senate Office Building.

### House

*Committee on Agriculture*, executive, to consider H.R. 18582, to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, 10 a.m., 1301 Longworth Building.

*Committee on Armed Services*, Special Subcommittee on Survivor Benefits, to continue hearings on survivor benefits to active duty and/or retired military personnel, 10 a.m., 2213 Rayburn Building.

Special Subcommittee on Defense Aspects of Equal Employment Opportunity Program, to continue hearings, 10 a.m., 2339 Rayburn Building.

Special Subcommittee on Exchanges and Commissaries, to continue hearings on the overall operation of exchanges and commissaries, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn Building.



## Next meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Thursday, July 23

## Next meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 a.m., Thursday, July 23

*Committee on Banking and Currency*, Subcommittee on Housing, to continue hearings on H.R. 17260, Lead-Based Paint Elimination Act of 1970, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn Building.

Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Urban Growth, to continue hearings on quality of urban life, 10 a.m., 2222 Rayburn Building.

*Committee on the District of Columbia*, Special Select Subcommittee to continue hearings on D.C. schools, 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth Building.

*Committee on Education and Labor*, General Subcommittee on Labor, to continue hearings on H.R. 10948, H.R. 17596, and related bills, Fair Labor Standards Act, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn Building.

*Committee on Foreign Affairs*, Subcommittee on the Near East, to continue hearings on problems of the Near East, 10 a.m., 2255 Rayburn Building.

Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, to continue hearings on measures relating to war-making powers, 2 p.m., 2255 Rayburn Building.

*Committee on Government Operations*, Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, to continue hearings on President Nixon's Reorganization Plan 3, to create an Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn Building.

*Committee on House Administration*, Subcommittee on Library and Memorials, to continue hearings on the Smithsonian Institution, 10 a.m., 2257 Rayburn Building.

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs*, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, executive, to mark up S. 719, to establish a national mining and minerals policy, 9:45 a.m., 1324 Longworth Building.

*Committee on Internal Security*, to continue hearings on the activities of the Black Panther Party in Detroit and Indianapolis, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon Building.

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce*, executive, to continue consideration of H.R. 17333, mutual funds; and H.R. 14931, consumer class action, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn Building.

*Committee on the Judiciary*, Subcommittee No. 2, to hold hearings on private claims bills, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn Building.

Subcommittee No. 3, to hold hearings on H.R. 14950, to amend title 18 of the U.S. Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice, 10 a.m., 2226 Rayburn Building.

Subcommittee No. 5, to continue hearings on S. 30, relating to the control of organized crime in the United States, 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn Building.

*Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries*, Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Navigation, to continue hearings on H.R. 17830, to promote the safety of ports, harbors, waterfront areas, and navigable waters of the United States, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth Building.

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service*, Subcommittee on Postal Operations, to continue hearings on H.R. 2730 and related bills, to prohibit the furnishing of mailing lists and other lists of names or addresses by Government agencies to the public in connection with the use of the U.S. mails, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon Building.

*Committee on Public Works*, Subcommittee on Roads, executive, to continue consideration of Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn Building.

*Committee on Science and Astronautics*, Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, to continue hearings on H. Con. Res. 666, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the development of a national science policy, 10 a.m., 2325 Rayburn Building.

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs*, Subcommittee on Insurance, executive, to consider H.R. 18448, to provide mortgage protection life insurance for service-connected disabled veterans who have received grants for specially adapted housing, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon Building.

*Committee on Ways and Means*, to continue hearings on legislation to regulate controlled dangerous substances and amend narcotics and drug laws, 10 a.m., committee room, Longworth Building.

## Joint Committee

*Joint Economic Committee*, to continue hearings to review the state of the national economy, to hear Federal Reserve Board Chairman Burns, 10 a.m., room S-407, Capitol.

*Conferees*, executive, on H.R. 15733, to provide for a 15-percent increase in pensions and annuities paid under the Railroad Retirement Act, 2:30 p.m., room S-146, Capitol.

*Conferees*, executive, on H.R. 17070, proposed Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act, 10:30 a.m., room EF-100, Capitol.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

## SENATE

Moss, Frank E., Utah, E6891  
Schweiker, Richard S., Pa., E6889, E6893, E6897

## HOUSE

Anderson, Glenn M., Calif., E6898  
Ashbrook, John M., Ohio, E6942  
Beall, J. Glenn, Jr., Md., E6905  
Bell, Alphonzo, Calif., E6897  
Blatnik, John A., Minn., E6930  
Boggs, Hale, La., E6915  
Broyhill, Joel T., Va., E6927  
Burke, James A., Mass., E6915  
Burton, Laurence J., Utah, E6899  
Bush, George, Tex., E6933

Byrnes, John W., Wis., E6906  
Chisholm, Shirley, N.Y., E6910  
Clausen, Don H., Calif., E6926  
Cowger, William O., Ky., E6911  
Duncan, John J., Tenn., E6898  
Eshleman, Edwin D., Pa., E6913  
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio, E6909  
Fish, Hamilton, Jr., N.Y., E6933  
Ford, William D., Mich., E6914  
Foreman, Ed, N. Mex., E6914, E6945  
Fulton, James G., Pa., E6936  
Giaino, Robert N., Conn., E6924  
Gude, Gilbert, Md., E6919  
Howard, James J., N.J., E6923  
Jones, Ed, Tenn., E6919  
Leggett, Robert L., Calif., E6896, E6941  
Long, Clarence D., Md., E6898  
Lujan, Manuel, Jr., N. Mex., E6930  
Matsuanaga, Spark M., Hawaii, E6934, E6944  
Miller, George P., Calif., E6907

Moss, John E., Calif., E6936  
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., Mass., E6925, E6941, E6947  
Pryor, David, Ark., E6918, E6944  
Pucinski, Roman C., Ill., E6927  
Robison, Howard W., N.Y., E6931, E6947  
Rosenthal, Benjamin S., N.Y., E6920  
Scherle, William J., Iowa, E6912, E6940  
Schmitz, John G., Calif., E6890  
Steiger, William A., Wis., E6913  
Teague, Olin E., Tex., E6899  
Tunney, John V., Calif., E6905  
Waldie, Jerome R., Calif., E6892  
Whalen, Charles W., Jr., Ohio, E6924  
Wilson, Bob, Calif., E6926, E6934, E6948  
Wilson, Charles H., Calif., E6933  
Wold, John, Wyo., E6906, E6944  
Wylder, John W., N.Y., E6935  
Wyman, Louis C., N.H., E6889, E6946  
Zwach, John M., Minn., E6897, E6941









# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of July 28, 1970  
91st-2nd; No. 128

### CONTENTS

Appalachia.....13	Cotton.....11	Interstate commerce....19
Appropriations.....1,7	Disaster Relief.....21	Lands.....3,17
Beef industry.....8	Electrification.....14	Meat Inspection.....8
Chugach Electric Assn..14	Employees.....10	Office of Education.....7
Civil Service.....10	Energy.....18	Pollution.....15,20
Claims.....23	Environment.....12,18,19	Symbol.....5
Consumers.....6	FFA.....16	Tobacco.....4,22
Consumer Protection.....9	Food dating.....6	Youth Conservation
Continuing Resolution...1	Housing.....24	Corps.....2

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed continuing resolution.  
Conferees filed report on Youth Conservation Corps bill.  
Senators Mansfield and Hruska defended their imported meat inspection bill.

### HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed H.J. Res. 1328, making further continuing appropriations for FY 71. pp. H7249-51  
Conferees filed report on HR 17548, the HUD appropriation bill FY 71 (H. Rept. No. 91-1345). p. H7329

2. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. Conferees filed report on S. 1076, establishing a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (H. Rept. No. 91-1338). p. H7329

3. LANDS. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported HR 13125, with amendments, to amend the act, as amended, relating to the admission of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington (H. Rept. No. 91-1340). p. H7329
4. TOBACCO. An Agriculture Committee subcommittee approved for full committee action a clean bill in lieu of HR 17945, authorizing the lease and transfer of burley tobacco acreage allotments. p. D829
5. SYMBOL. The Judiciary Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3838, to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the antilitter symbol "Johnny Horizon". p. D830
6. CONSUMERS. Rep. Farbstein inserted several articles reporting the results of surveys of grocery stores' practices in food-dating. pp. H7303-13

SENATE

7. APPROPRIATIONS. Voted unanimous passage of HR 16916, the Office of Education appropriations bill for FY 1971. This bill now goes to the President. pp. S12233-57
8. MEAT INSPECTION. Senators Mansfield and Hruska responded to criticism of their sponsorship of S. 3942, to provide for inspection of imported meat, placing various reports in the Record which defend the domestic beef industry against the charge of protectionism, stating that the farmer and rancher get less in terms of 1970 dollars than they got 20 years ago in terms of 1950 dollars for the beef cattle they sell. pp. S12182-90
9. CONSUMER PROTECTION. The Committee on Commerce ordered favorably reported (but did not actually report) with amendments, S. 3201, the proposed Consumer Protection Act. p. D827
10. CIVIL SERVICE; EMPLOYEES. Sen. Hartke stated his intention to hold hearings on legislation to increase the retirement benefits of Civil Service retirees, stating that 60% of the nearly one million retired Federal employees receive less than \$3000 annually, the poverty level. pp. S12198-9
11. COTTON. Sen. Talmadge reported on the plight of the cotton farmers in Georgia and placed in the Record a newspaper interview with the three cotton producers who received more than \$100,000 each in farm payments last year. pp. S12209-11



## YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

---

JULY 28, 1970.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. PERKINS, from the committee of conference,  
submitted the following

### CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 1076]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

#### POLICY AND PURPOSE

*SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment during the summer months of American youth, representing all segments of society, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.*

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

*SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Con-*

servation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age fifteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ during the summer months without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary.

(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

#### SECRETARIAL DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall:

(1) determine the areas under their administrative jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out programs using employees of the Corps;

(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: Provided, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the Corps in their duties. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for at least five years for the operation of any Youth Conservation Corps project. Whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied federal facilities, including military facilities, shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps where appropriate and with the approval of the Federal agency involved. To minimize transportation costs Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

(4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members;

(5) prepare a report, indicating the most feasible and efficient method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

(b) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support staff.

#### SECRETARIAL REPORTS

SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a joint report



*detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.*

#### AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

*SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act.*

And the House agree to the same.

CARL D. PERKINS,  
DOMINICK V. DANIELS,  
JAMES G. O'HARA,  
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,  
WILLIAM D. FORD,  
LLOYD MEEDS,  
PHILLIP BURTON,  
EDITH GREEN,  
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,  
ALBERT H. QUIE,  
MARVIN L. ESCH,  
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,  
JOHN N. ERLNBORN,  
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN,  
JAMES M. COLLINS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HENRY M. JACKSON,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
FRANK E. MOSS,  
GORDON ALLOTT,  
TED STEVENS,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment called for Youth Conservation Corps members to be representative of "all segments of society." The Senate bill did not contain such a provision. The conference substitute adopts the language of the House amendment in this respect.

The Senate statement of purpose referred to activities of the corps on public lands and water areas "administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture." The House amendment contained comparable language with respect to conservation areas but did not refer to specific Federal agencies. The conference report makes specific reference to these Federal agencies.

The House amendment limited the corpsmen's minimum age to 16 years while in the Senate bill the minimum age would have been 14 years. The conference report specifies that the minimum age of a corpsman shall be 15 years.

The Senate bill required preference be given to disadvantaged youth to become corpsmen and that preference for selecting supervisory personnel be given to "primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators, and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resources disciplines." The House amendment contained neither of these preference categories. The conference substitute does not contain this provision. In rejecting the Senate provision the conferees do not want their action to be interpreted as precluding from participation those given preference in the Senate bill. To the contrary the conferees expect that full and fair consideration will be given to all applicants.

The House amendment specifically included youth of both sexes in the program by reference in two places (secs. 2(a) and 2(b)). The Senate bill included youth of both sexes by reference in section 2(a). The conference report makes reference to youth of both sexes in sections 2(a) and 2(b).

The Senate bill required that corps programs be carried out only on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture or Interior. Under the House amendment the Secretaries were to designate the public lands to be used and coordinate corps efforts with those agencies having jurisdiction over such lands. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Both bills authorized contracting for equipment, transportation, lodging, subsistence and other services by components or as a package,



although House language was more explicit. The House amendment required that any organization contracted with must have been in existence for at least 5 years. The House amendment allowed use of unoccupied Federal facilities including abandoned military installations. The Senate bill also allowed use of unoccupied facilities operated by Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, but required approval of the Secretary of Defense to use unoccupied military facilities. The Senate amendment qualified use of other Federal agency facilities to where "feasible and appropriate." The House amendment qualified such use as where "economically feasible." The conference report in resolving these differences provides that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the corps in their duties. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for at least 5 years for the operation of any Youth Conservation Corps project. Whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities, including military facilities, shall be utilized for the purposes of the corps where appropriate and with the approval of the Federal agency involved.

Both bills required a report from the Secretary of Agriculture and from the Secretary of the Interior with respect to initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State agencies, but the Senate required the report to indicate the "feasibility" of such a program while the House amendment called for the report to indicate the "most efficient method for initiating" such a program. The conference report provides that the report indicate the most feasible and efficient method for initiating such a program.

CARL D. PERKINS,  
 DOMINICK V. DANIELS,  
 JAMES G. O'HARA,  
 WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,  
 WILLIAM D. FORD,  
 LLOYD MEEDS,  
 PHILLIP BURTON,  
 EDITH GREEN,  
 AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
 JOSEPH M. GAYDOS,  
 ALBERT H. QUIE,  
 MARVIN L. ESCH,  
 WILLIAM A. STEIGER,  
 JOHN N. ERLNBORN,  
 EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN,  
 JAMES M. COLLINS,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*













# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of July 30, 1970  
91st-2nd; No. 130

### CONTENTS

Appropriations.....4,9	Foreign trade.....16	Pollution.....8,14,17
Bills reported.....3	Fuel.....23	Postal Reform.....5
Consumers.....3,7	Housing.....11,25	Property.....3
Continuing Resolution....9	IRC.....10	Reorganization.....13
Credit unions.....24	Indians.....10	Sen. Holland.....18
Dairy program.....21	Information.....19	Symbol.....3
Environment.....20,23	Lists.....19	Tariff Act.....10
Farm payments.....2	Meats.....6	Urban development.....11
Foods.....7	Motor Vehicles.....3	Watersheds.....12
Farmers.....15	Ocean Research.....13	Youth Conservation Corps.....1
	Personnel.....22	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed continuing resolution.  
House agreed to conference report on Youth Conservation Corps bill.  
Rep. Madden supported \$20,000 farm payment limitation.

### HOUSE

1. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. Agreed to conference report on S. 1076, establishing a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps. p. H7456
2. FARM PAYMENTS. Rep. Madden placed two editorials in the Record in support of limiting farm payments to \$20,000. p. H7471

3. **BILLS REPORTED.** Committee on the Judiciary reported without amendment S. 3838, preventing the unauthorized manufacture and use of the antilitter character "Johnny Horizon" (H. Rept. 91-1356). p. H7499

Committee on Government Operations reported the following bills without amendment:

S. 406, permitting the rotation of certain property whenever its remaining storage or shelf life is too short to justify its retention (H. Rept. 91-1357);

S. 2763, allowing the purchase of additional systems and equipment for passenger motor vehicles over and above the statutory price limitation (H. Rept. 91-1358);

HR 18214, establishing an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive office of the President (H. Rept. 91-1361). p. H7499

4. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Agreed to the conference report on HR 16915, the legislative branch appropriation bill FY 71. pp. H7466-70

5. **POSTAL REFORM.** Conferees agreed to file report on HR 17070, the proposed Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act. pp. D845-6

6. **MEATS.** Cong. Monagan suggested that consideration be given to adjusting meat imports to meet the gap, if any, between the demand for lean beef and the domestic production of such beef. p. H7475

7. **CONSUMERS.** Rep. Farbstein discussed the problem of pressure exerted on newspapers and the broadcast media by food advertisers and inserted several articles regarding food-dating practices of grocery chains. pp. H7477-90

8. **POLLUTION.** Rep. Monagan urged action to combat airborne mercury and lead contamination. pp. H7492-3

#### SENATE

9. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Passed without amendment H.J. Res. 1328, making continuing appropriations through October 15, 1970. This bill now goes to the President. pp. S12421-2

10. **TARIFF ACT; IRC; INDIANS.** Both Houses received letters from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting draft legislative proposals to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and received from the Secretary of the Interior drafts of proposed legislation having to do with services rendered the Indian population. pp. S12429; H7488-9



"The Tennessee Valley Authority has cited a shortage of coal as a primary factor in raising its prices. But the Tennessee Valley Authority has for years been accused of driving small coal operators out of business by its buying policies."

The Tennessee Valley Authority has done a magnificent job of providing power for the development and industrialization of the Tennessee Valley Region. But it has, in the process, become seemingly myopic in that it is out to produce power and only power at any expense.

"In fact, a measurable percentage of the power now produced by the TVA is actually being transmitted out of the TVA area to other power companies. Thus, TVA power users within the TVA region are being asked by this rate increase to subsidize power which they will never use and which, if it were not being exported, might ease any legitimate need for a rate increase at this time.

"All this leads me to fear that the TVA authorities may be losing sight of the fact they are to serve the public in general and not just the TVA as some sort of insulated institution."

This latest rate increase should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress and I have written my Tennessee colleague, Hon. Joe L. Evins, urging that, as Acting Chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, he initiate such an investigation. I am also suggesting to Mr. Evins that such an investigation be particularly sensitive to the possibility of a full inquiry into the policies and procedures of the Tennessee Valley Authority in view of its seeming concentration on power production at the expense of continued and future economic viability within the TVA region, disregard of the public interest through ultra high inflationary rate increases, and actual and potential danger to the environment posed by its power producing methods and procedures.

"I know of no man in the Congress more able and qualified to conduct such an investigation and I am certain Mr. Evins will undertake appropriate and responsible action. He will have my full support."

Mr. Chairman, the morning following this statement I received a letter from the Honorable Frank E. Smith, Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I must say that this too, was a disappointment because in essence, Mr. Smith stated simply that the TVA authorities were "required by our oath of office to fulfill the terms of the law."

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smith's letter exhibited a near callous indifference to the public interest in general and to the U.S. Congress in particular and I place it in the body of the RECORD at this point:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,  
Knoxville, Tenn., July 29, 1970.

Hon. RICHARD FULTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: I have read in this morning's *Knoxville Journal* your statement protesting the TVA rate increase.

Let me suggest that you read the TVA Act, as amended by the self-financing bill of 1959. The law directly requires us to charge rates sufficient to meet our costs. If the Congress can subsidize any difference between costs and income, we will be happy to reduce the rates by the equivalent of the subsidy. We are required by our oath of office to fulfill the terms of the law, however, as I am sure you understand.

Our books are open now, as they always have been, for study or investigation by any Congressional committee. Let me remind you, however, that an inquiry of the nature which you suggest can only lead to pressures which will likely result in even higher TVA rates.

In the eight years I have been with TVA we have been involved in a constant struggle to keep our power rates down. Part of that struggle has made it necessary to reject many requests from good friends in Congress that would have occasioned greater costs for the TVA power system.

We are hopeful that no further rate raises of this amount will be necessary in the future, but there can be no guarantee as long as fuel and money costs continue to rise. I am confident, however, that when the current round of power rate increases going on all over the country is concluded that TVA rates will be in approximately the same proportion to those of private power companies as they have in the past.

I am puzzled by the statement attributed to you that TVA authorities "may be losing sight of the fact they are to serve the public in general and not just the TVA as some sort of insulated institution." We are fulfilling our responsibility to the public by fulfilling the law and refusing to heed advice which would invite financial disaster. The choice here is between continuation of TVA and its destruction.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,  
Director.

Mr. Chairman, in my part of the country the Tennessee Valley Authority has done so much for us and become so important to us that it apparently has assumed the attitude that it should be immune to criticism and that any one who implies criticism either has not read the TVA Act as amended by the 1959 self-financing bill or is in conspiracy with those who would destroy TVA.

However, I felt compelled to respond immediately to Mr. Smith's letter and include a copy of that response in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1970.

Hon. FRANK E. SMITH,  
Director Office of the Board of Directors,  
Tennessee Valley Authority,  
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Thank you for your rapid response to my statement protesting the TVA rate increase which was carried in the July 29th edition of the *Knoxville Journal*.

Appreciate your suggestion that I read the TVA Act, as amended by the self-financing bill of 1959. I have. And certainly I am aware of the fact that you are required by your oath of office to fulfill the terms of the law. However, fulfilling the terms of the law and blindly tracking it are two different matters.

Frank, as a former Member of Congress, I am sure you are conscious of the public impact that a 20 to 25 percent increase in rates would have had during your service in the United States House of Representatives. Thus, in this highly inflationary period, you certainly must have anticipated the public anguish which this latest rate increase has created.

But to pass it off by simply saying "we are required by our oath of office to fulfill the terms of the law," is to take almost a "public be darned" attitude.

I say this because the Tennessee Valley Authority has made no attempt, to my knowledge, to inform the Congress or appropriate Committee members within the Congress that such a drastic rate increase

was forthcoming. Had this been done discussion might have led to some alternative and the impact of increase reduced, not only in terms of public outrage but also in terms of percentage of rate increase.

Chairman Wagner discussed the possibility of rate increase with Rep. Joe L. Evins when Chairman Wagner testified before Mr. Evins' Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. Certainly at that time you must have had certain knowledge that a big rate increase was forthcoming. The question was not "if" but "how much" and "when." TVA has had ample time to inform the Congress of its plight. It certainly was not hesitant to do so when it came to us requesting in detail an increase of \$5 billion in its bonding authority.

You also express confidence "... that when the current round of power rate increases going on all over the country is concluded that TVA rates will be in approximately the same proportion to those of private power companies as they have in the past." Are you saying that TVA now proposes to engage in a game of price increase leapfrog with private power producers? Your job is to hold back rates not set the pace for private power concerns so they can increase consumer costs and justify an increase in profit by saying: "See, TVA increased their rates so we must increase ours."

You express the hope no further "rate increases of this amount will be necessary in the future, but there can be no guarantee as long as fuel and money costs continue to rise." Chairman Wagner, in his letter to me of July 17 announcing the rate increases also cited fuel costs as a primary factor in the rate increase. Quoting from the announcement attached to his letter: "TVA said factors in this increase include the rising demand for coal and 'seller's market' price trends, the coal industry's costs of meeting mine safety and strip mine reclamation requirements, increased transportation costs and coal car shortages. . . ." Does not the TVA have long-term multi-year contracts with its coal suppliers? Have they all run out at one given point in time and must now be renewed or are your suppliers failing to honor their contracts? I would very much like to have an answer to these questions.

Frank, you are well aware of my strong support of the TVA and my effort to expose to the public the scheme to sell it to private power interests in October of 1963. I have always supported the TVA but my support has in the past been based on the belief that the TVA was a positive instrument of economic progress. This latest rate increase, as high as it is and with as little public justification as it has been given, just does not seem to fit the configuration of economic progress because it threatens to close down plants, curtail expansion in others, increase unemployment and create additional inflationary pressure.

Finally you state, "I am puzzled by the statement attributed to you that TVA authorities 'may be losing sight of the fact they are to serve the public in general and not just the TVA as some sort of insulated institution.'" Let me clarify that point for you. When any utility, public or private, increases consumer costs by an inflationary 20 to 25 percent without sensitivity to public opinion or to its authorizing body, in this case the United States Congress, then I cannot but conclude that it is certainly an "insulated institution."

Sincerely,

RICHARD FULTON,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, once again I urge passage of this legislation before us today. Our chairman has stated the case of need for this legislation in clear and precise



terms and I wish to be associated with his remarks in this regard.

However, I do not intend to permit the matter of this unprecedented rate increase by the Tennessee Valley Authority to pass without careful examination. I want to know the reasons behind the explanations given in justification of the increase and I intend to learn them.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C. 831n-4, Supplement IV), is amended by striking out "\$1,750,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000,000".*

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18104) to amend section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase the amount of bonds which may be issued by the Tennessee Valley authority, pursuant to House Resolution 1150, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just considered and include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1076, YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 28, 1970.)

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Kentucky give the benefit of his observations and comments on the conference report to the Members?

Mr. PERKINS. I shall be delighted to do so. First, let me state that there was no difference between the Senate and the House with regard to the authorization. A total of \$10,500,000 is authorized over a 3-year period—in other words, \$3.5 million annually.

I am pleased to advise the House that the conference report before us which authorizes a conservation program involving our young people has been signed by 16 of the 17 House conferees and by all of the Senate conferees. There were very few differences between the House and Senate versions of this legislation and most of these were of a minor or technical nature.

The major difference between the two bills related to the minimum age for participation in the corps. The Senate bill set the minimum age at 14, whereas in the House bill it was 16. The conference report limits participation to youth who are 15 years of age or above.

Under the Senate bill the corps program could only be conducted on public lands and waters under the jurisdictions of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Under the House bill a program could be conducted on any Federal property. Since this is a pilot program the conference report follows the more limited provision of the Senate bill.

Both bills authorized contracting for lodging and subsistence and other services by components or as a package. The House amendment required that any organization contracted with must have been nonprofit and in existence for at least 5 years. Under the conference report the two House limitations are retained when a contract is entered into with a local educational agency or other public or private agency for the entire operation of a corps program. The limitations will not apply when the Departments contract for individual or component services for a program.

Finally, the Senate bill required preference be given to disadvantaged youth to become corpsmen and that preference be accorded in the selection of supervisory personnel for the corps to elementary and secondary and college teachers and college students pursuing studies in the education and natural resources disciplines. The conference report follows the House and does not contain these preferences. It was the theory of the House that, inasmuch as the bill was patterned after the original Civilian Conservation Corps, we should permit

all segments of society to participate. This concept was protected. I wish to point out, however, that it was the feeling of the conferees that teachers and students in the conservation fields are extremely well qualified for supervisory positions in the corps and thus it is expected that very many of the supervisory positions will be filled by such personnel. It is our view, also, that the corps, through the provision of gainful summer employment, can make a significant contribution toward meeting the needs of disadvantaged youth. I urge the conference report be adopted.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In the conference report are there any mandatory spending provisions?

Mr. PERKINS. There are no mandatory spending provisions in the conference report. I have always been a great believer in programs of this type. I personally feel that we are not doing enough in this area. I am hopeful that, after we give the pilot program a trial, we will be able to greatly expand this conservation program.

[Mr. MEEDS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 17880, AMENDING DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1168, Report No. 91-1355) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 1168

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17880) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 17880, the Committee on Banking and Currency shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3302, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 17880 as passed by the House.









S. 1046. An act to protect consumers by providing a civil remedy for misrepresentation of the quality of articles composed in whole or in part of gold or silver and for other purposes;

S. 1456. An act to amend section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising;

S. 3274. An act to implement the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards; and

S. 3889. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 1 year the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

#### REPORT ON STATUS OF THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-372)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Long) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress the Sixth Annual Report on the Status of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and to affirm this Administration's intent to pursue the objectives of the National Wilderness Act aggressively in the coming months.

Wilderness is a magnificent part of the American heritage. The wilderness that witnessed the nation's birth no longer spreads from one ocean to the other, but neither has it all been tamed. Many of these untamed lands, majestic reminders of primeval America, have been reserved and now comprise the National Wilderness Preservation System. We must do more now to preserve additional areas of this priceless national heritage.

During 1969, I signed into law the addition of two new units to the National Wilderness Preservation System. However, I am convinced that in the past we have moved too slowly, in both the executive and the legislative branches, towards the goal of completion of our national wilderness system.

I have asked that the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior begin immediately to augment their efforts in the study of possible wilderness areas, as directed by the Act, and to accelerate the study schedules which they have been following. I have asked them to review their needs for additional resources and will ask the Congress for any additional funding which may be needed to make this new wilderness effort possible.

On the legislative side, the Congress now has before it twenty wilderness proposals transmitted by the previous Administration and endorsed by this Administration. Early action on these measures would represent the quickest way to expand our wilderness system. Therefore, I urge the Congress to give speedy and favorable consideration to as many of these proposals as possible at this session of the Congress.

I look forward to the next annual report on the wilderness system, confident that I will be able to report substantial and encouraging progress on both the study and the enactment of wilderness proposals. I cannot stress too strongly my conviction that we must push vigorously ahead to preserve for future generations the opportunity to enjoy the singular encounter with nature which only wilderness can provide.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 5, 1970.

#### REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Long) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Transmitted herewith is the Twenty-first Semiannual Report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 5, 1970.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer (Mr. Long) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of J. Fred Buzhardt, Jr., of South Carolina, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 2 p.m., with the understanding the Chair may call the Senate into session before that time.

The motion was agreed to, and at 1:29 p.m. the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 2 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GOLDWATER).

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3302) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PATMAN, Mrs.

SULLIVAN, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. MIZE, and Mr. BLACKBURN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 1703. An act for the relief of Rosa Pintabona;

S. 1704. An act for the relief of Lillian Biazzo;

S. 2427. An act for the relief of Cal C. Davis and Lyndon A. Dean;

S. 2863. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cum-orah Kennington Romney;

S. 3136. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Guy Andre Blanchette;

H.R. 14714. An act to improve the administration of the national park system by the Secretary of the Interior, and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14705. An act to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 17123, and the pending question is on agreeing to amendment No. 819.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.



The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 28, 1970, pages H7229-H7230, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate conferees, I would like to make the following statement in support of the action taken by the conference committee with respect to S. 1076, to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps. The Senate passed this bill last year. The House amended it in certain respects which, in the judgment of the Senate, warranted a conference on the differences.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided that the Corps will be open to "youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications." The House version contained additional language that members of the Corps shall represent "all segments of society." The conference retained the language common to both versions and adopted the additional House language in order to emphasize the intent of both Houses that the Corps be composed of youths representing as broad a cross section of American society as possible.

The statement of policy and purpose in the Senate bill limited the areas appropriate for Corps activities to areas administered by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture. The House amendment contained no such limitation. Because those two Secretaries are charged with the administration of the program and most of the lands appropriate for Corps activities, the conferees decided to adopt the limitation imposed by the Senate version.

The Senate bill provided a minimum age of 14 for members of the Corps. The House amendment specified a minimum age of 16. The value of exposing the younger teenagers to the outdoors and to conservation practices was acknowledged and was balanced against a desire to assure that Corps members will be sufficiently mature to make substantial contributions to and receive significant benefits from the program. The conference committee adopted a minimum age of 15 in an effort to compromise our differences.

The Senate bill provided that a preference should be given to disadvantaged youth in the selection of Corps members. The House amendment did not contain such a preference. The conferees decided that a preference for disadvantaged youth might result in the Corps being composed entirely or almost entirely of such youths, thus detracting from the objective of both Houses that the Corps be composed of representatives of varied social, economic, and racial backgrounds. Therefore, although it is the intent and belief of the conferees that disadvantaged youth should be significantly represented in the Corps, the conference report does not contain a statutory pref-

erence for them. We expect these young people will make and receive real contributions as a result of this program.

The Senate bill also contains a preference with respect to temporary supervisory personnel for "primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators, and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resources disciplines." The House amendment did not contain such a preference. The conferees acknowledged that those individuals would be among the most suitable temporary supervisory personnel because of training, experience, and availability, but decided to exclude any specific provision favoring them in order not to exclude or discourage other qualified persons from participating or seeking to participate in the program as supervisory personnel. Again, however, we feel these people will be most interested and best suited to assist in this program.

The Senate bill included in the program youth of both sexes in section 2(a). The House amendment mentioned in both section 2(a) and section 2(b) that the program should include youth of both sexes. The conference report adopts the House language to make clear that both young men and young women are intended to be included in the Corps. The Senate intended this to be the case.

The Senate bill required Corps activities to take place only on lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture such as national parks and forests. The House amendment allowed Corps activities to take place on all public lands. The conference report adopts the Senate version, which will simplify administration without sacrificing program objectives.

The House amendment directed the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to "arrange directly or by contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for 5 years for transportation, lodging, subsistence, other services and equipment for the needs of the members of the Corps in fulfilling their duties." The Senate bill merely allowed the Secretaries to arrange for such services and equipment. The intent of the additional House language was to allow the Secretaries discretionary authority to contract with appropriate agencies and organizations to operate Corps projects. The conference report adopts the Senate language with respect to support services and adds a new sentence to effect the intent of the House language.

The Senate bill provided for use of vacated civilian conservation centers and other unoccupied facilities under the jurisdiction of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, as well as unoccupied military facilities—upon approval of the Secretary of Defense—for the purposes of the Corps. The House amendment permitted the use of any unoccupied Federal facilities, whenever economically feasible. The conference report provides for the use of any Federal facility where economically feasible, but only upon approval of the Federal agency

responsible for administering the facility.

The Senate bill required a report from the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture within 1 year of the date of enactment indicating "the feasibility of" initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies. The House amendment required an identical report, except that the report would indicate "the most efficient method for" rather than "the feasibility of" initiating such a program. The conference report reflects the language of both versions by calling for the report to indicate "the most feasible and efficient method."

Mr. President, this conference report represents the finest tradition of the legislative process. I commend the Chairman of the House Committee, the Honorable CARL PERKINS of Kentucky, and his colleagues for their fairness and cooperation. I believe we have a good bill and I am happy to recommend it to the Senate, the President, and our Nation's young people.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I just want to say a word or two about this matter. We had a very felicitous conference committee meeting on the bill. We were able to arrive at agreements on these various matters.

One thing in particular the House did not wish to have in there was the provision we had in the bill that "primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators, and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resources disciplines" be preferred in the handling of these students. The feeling in the House, and I must say I agree, is that there are many people who would make excellent teachers and instructors in these outdoor programs who would not necessarily fall within the categorical description the Senate placed in the bill. I agree with this position. I do not think we should preclude by any means those classifications the Senate put in the bill; but on the other hand there are a great many able leaders and instructors who do not fall within that category. I am glad this was handled as it has been.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. We are now heavily engaged in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in writing a manpower training bill. One of the aspects of the manpower training bill relates to public service jobs. We have great differences of opinion between the minority and the majority, but it seems clear that some element of public service jobs will be included.

Will the Senator give us some view from the committee, which I think would be very useful, as to the degree of legislative oversight to be exercised, to be sure there is in this operation the input which should come from agencies dealing with manpower problems?

If we obtain all we are looking for, it would now all be concentrated under the Department of Labor.

Would the chairman or the ranking



minority member give us some assurance that in this pilot plan operation, of which I approve, every effort will be made for the right hand to know what the left hand is doing and that every effort will be made to have input of experience, knowledge, and so forth, of the departments responsible for the proposed new manpower training program?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. We have in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, a distinguished ranking member of that committee, the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), one other Senator, and me.

We intend to follow this program very closely, if for no other reason, that it is a pilot program. We will have to make a decision later on regarding the extension and the expansion of the program.

I believe what we have worked out here covers an area of employment that is unique and pertains, of course, to the natural resource area of our country, the lands owned by the Federal Government and managed in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior.

In addition, there is the ongoing effort here of trying to provide for an orientation for these young men and women during the summer months of June, July, and August. We want them to be educated and trained to better understand nature, wildlife, and the environment as a whole.

Therefore, this program, I wish to say to my distinguished friend from New York, is unique in that respect. We have carved out an area here that is not new; it is an area where during the 1930's the Civilian Conservation Corps made great progress in one of the finest programs in the area of resource protection ever developed.

We have modified that. We have covered the youth 15 years of age to 18 years of age during the summer months only. I believe very strongly and firmly that this program has to be related to the Job Corps and other efforts aimed at hiring the youth; but we are not moving into any area of duplication, and we will follow it closely.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. That is important.

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree it is important. We have kept this in the confines of the 2 departments concerned, with no idea of moving over into the general manpower area or the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to tell both Senators I do not care if you do move ahead if that is the important thing to do, but I want this program made as relevant as possible to the taxpayers' money being spent in manpower. We have a \$2 billion bill proposed in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and we may learn a lot from this \$3.5 million experience.

As Senators know, and I have had support from them, I have fought for the summer job program. Again, there is a relevancy. I want to be sure that we will see that the input of everything going on is a part of this program and it may be that other programs should in part

yield to this program, but let us not treat this as some isolated effort. I am not jealous of our jurisdiction. Let us get the benefit of manpower training just as you should get it in other departments.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I concur in what the Senator has said.

By reason of the very nature of the places where this would occur there would always be, no matter what the money available, a certain limitation on what can be done on the youth conservation program in this area. I agree it is something we will have to watch and watch very closely and see that it works.

By way of observation, I thought the Civilian Conservation Corps got to be a little bit obnoxious at the end; but at the same time I can take the Senator out into parts of the West today and show him contouring that was done by the Civilian Conservation Corps which is still present. It can still be seen. One can see what has been done for the grasslands and the vegetation there. That is the sort of thing we can do with this program, by helping to bring about a permanent foundation for the country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in agreement.

Inasmuch as I am so heavily involved in the other manpower program, I want to be sure that this would work both ways; that is, receiving the benefit of everything they learn in manpower and being able to absorb everything from the manpower area.

We just voted public service jobs this morning. I am not in complete agreement with it, but it is in the bill, for both rural and urban areas.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have just a few comments to make. I think the importance of the bill has been overlooked in some ways. As far as my State is concerned, over one-half of the public lands of the United States are in Alaska. This is a step in the right direction in putting into Alaskan public lands the concept of the Civilian Conservation Corps. My generation does not necessarily look on the Corps with the same feeling as some of my colleagues because we have seen the public parks and facilities created during that period by the Corps and, by and large, they were very good.

I am hopeful that the administration will examine carefully the objectives that have been set forth by the chairman and the ranking member of our committee. They will notice the provision that states, "wherever economically feasible—military facilities shall be utilized for the purpose of the Corps."

There are many vacant military bases that have been abandoned, such as the NIKE sites and other bases that have recently been closed, which are very susceptible to use by the Corps; and the \$3.5 million should not be used for the physical plant in carrying out this pilot program.

If it is, it will not go very far, and we, who have half the public lands of the United States, may not get to participate

in the program unless they use the abandoned facilities that are still ready and available and could be used for the period of time contemplated by the pilot project.

I hope we will be back next year—if not then, in 2 years—to expand the program and make it much more meaningful to my State.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, may I express my deep appreciation to the senior Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) for his strong support of this program, as well as the senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS).

The senior Senator from Alaska, of course, has long been concerned with the possibility of using young men and women in connection with our public lands administered by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, because of the great opportunities in Alaska. I want to commend him for his support in making this legislation possible.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps will be most beneficial to this country. As a cosponsor of S. 1076, I am most pleased to endorse the conference report on this legislation. I urge Senators to join me in voting for the adoption of the report.

This legislation establishes a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program for young men and women, 15 to 18 years of age. The program will be administered in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. These young Americans will participate in summer work and educational projects in our national parks, forests, recreation areas, wildlife refuges, and other Federal lands.

The benefits of this program are many. It will give the youth of the Nation, who are our greatest national asset, an opportunity to engage in educational and constructive labor on our public lands. The development and improvement of our public lands will benefit all people.

There is great concern throughout the Nation for the maintenance of our natural environment. The young have been in the forefront of the move to save the environment. This program provides an opportunity for our youth to direct this concern into constructive and productive efforts. At the same time, this work will enhance their understanding of the natural environment and its relationship to them.

In this time when the overwhelming majority of our population is urban, it is very important that we provide opportunities for the young people to get out of the cities and onto the land, into the forests and parks, and to give them a deep appreciation for these great natural treasures which are theirs.

These young people will be performing a great variety of useful projects. They will work on timber stand improvement, trail maintenance, wildlife habitat improvement, basic soil and water conservation projects, and maintenance and construction of campgrounds and picnic facilities.



Mr. President, I cannot think of a better way to instill a deep and lasting appreciation of our natural heritage in a young person than to give him the opportunity to plant a tree, to build a camping facility, or to clear a trail. This personal involvement will yield many long-lasting benefits.

This is an excellent program, and I am hopeful that this 3-year pilot project will later be developed and expanded so that any young person who wishes to do so will have an opportunity to participate.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to join me in support of this beneficial legislation and to adopt the conference report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the ABM is once again before the Senate. A full year has passed since we voted, on August 6, 1969, to approve Safeguard phase I by initiating deployment at Grand Forks and Malmstrom Air Force Bases.

The last year has seen many changes, a number of which should have an important influence on the issue of whether to approve an additional site to protect our land-based deterrent. The central changes I have in mind are well known to many Senators and, before we vote, I hope they will be known and seriously considered by us all:

In the last year the Soviet threat to our land-based deterrent has significantly increased, at a rate that has exceeded the intelligence projections made a year ago;

By action of the Armed Services Committee, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, Senator STENNIS, Safeguard has been confined to defense of the deterrent; authorization of a thin area defense has been specifically denied;

Contrary to the expectations of many opponents of Safeguard, the SALT talks have convened and made substantial

progress toward agreement covering ABM defenses and offensive strategic weapons;

In the last year Safeguard has made excellent technical progress.

I shall discuss these developments in some detail now and in the course of the debate over the continuing deployment of Safeguard. The point I wish to emphasize is that there have been major changes since last year both in Safeguard itself and in the circumstances that surround the issue of its further deployment. I am hopeful that the debate this year will reflect these changes. To my mind they make affirmative Senate action on the further deployment of Safeguard more desirable and necessary than ever.

#### THE SOVIET STRATEGIC THREAT

The alarming increase in the Soviet strategic forces was discussed last year in great detail, especially in the closed session of the Senate. While I wish I could report that the threat has tapered off, as many of us hoped and some believed would happen, the inescapable fact is that the Soviets are deploying offensive weapons at a very considerable cost to themselves and at a rate that has exceeded last year's pessimistic projections.

The most disturbing increase in Soviet deployment has been in their land-based missile force, particularly the large SS-9. Last year many of us were concerned at the prospect of 1,300 Soviet ICBM's. This year we are concerned even more deeply because the number completed or under construction is now in excess of 1,450. This contrasts with 1,054 U.S. land-based strategic missiles.

Unfortunately, the contrast just begins with total numbers of launchers. Even more disturbing is the fact that the total megatonnage that the Soviets can deliver against U.S. targets with this large and increasing force is several times our own.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or would he—

Mr. JACKSON. I would prefer to wait until I finish, if my good friend would not mind.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Surely.

Mr. JACKSON. This advantage in "throw weight" means that the Soviets will be able to deploy MIRV's with sufficient yield and accuracy combinations to destroy our Minuteman missiles in their hardened silos. When the Soviets succeed in perfecting a MIRV device, each SS-9 launcher, of which the Soviets now have operational or under construction more than 280, would be capable of delivering three 5-megaton warheads at intercontinental ranges. The reentry pattern of the present triplet warhead extensively tested on the SS-9 may already threaten individual Minuteman silos. The unfortunate fact is that by the mid-1970's the Soviets may be in a position to destroy all but a few tens of our Minuteman missile force, if this force remains undefended.

This gloomy projection was before the Senate last year. I hope that some of those who did not take it seriously then will reconsider their position now, in light of the intervening Soviet increases.

Mr. President, what is perhaps most ominous about the growth in the Soviet

SS-9 force is that the SS-9 is an extremely inefficient weapon for retaliating against cities. For this purpose the Soviets have available more than 800 SS-11 and SS-13 missiles similar to our Minuteman and perfectly adequate as a deterrent force. While the SS-9 is inefficiently designed as a deterrent weapon, it is extremely well adapted to a counterforce role. It is this fact—the capability of the SS-9 to destroy hardened missile silos—that cannot be ignored in deciding our strategic posture and the future security of our deterrent force.

A few months ago there were some reports in the press and elsewhere that the Soviets had stopped deploying strategic missiles. The hopes built upon these reports were profoundly disappointed early last month when Secretary Laird announced that recent intelligence confirmed several new starts of the SS-9 and other offensive missiles. To make matters worse, the newly discovered SS-9's had been started after the second phase of the SALT talks was underway in Vienna.

The Soviet buildup of land-based offensive missiles has been paralleled by an equally rapid expansion of their Y-class submarine force. The Soviets are expected to have, within the next 2 years, an operational force of from 24 to 30 Polaris-type boats, and they are presently constructing these submarines at a rate of 8 to 10 per year.

Mr. President, more than a recitation of these disturbing numbers is necessary to appreciate the magnitude and direction of the growing Soviet threat. Some other facts must be considered:

The Soviets have carried out extensive and highly successful test programs of both offensive and defensive strategic weapons systems in the last year;

The Soviets have continued to invest more in military research and development than we have, and have sustained a strategic budget that exceeds our own;

The Soviets, with a smaller GNP than ours and a serious deficiency of consumer goods, have now invested approximately \$9 billion in SS-9's alone—a figure that exceeds our entire strategic offense and defense budget for fiscal year 1971.

The Soviets have conducted extensive tests of various ABM components in the last year while continuing work on the ABM system deployed around Moscow.

The central fact around which the debate over the deployment of Safeguard should revolve is that the Soviet Union has continued to support, at great cost, a comprehensive, dynamic program of strategic weapons procurement that shows no sign of slowing down. On the contrary, the hopes of those who last year urged that we wait and see whether the Soviet buildup would continue have been bitterly disappointed.

#### THE SAFEGUARD PROGRAM

Mr. President, the authorization we are now debating is for the continuation of the two phase I sites at Grand Forks and Malmstrom Air Force Bases and the initiating of an additional site, identical to the others except that it will not include a PAR radar, at Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri. In addition to these three sites, all at Minuteman bases, the











Public Law 91-378  
91st Congress, S. 1076  
August 13, 1970

## An Act

To establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

Youth Conserva-  
tion Corps.  
Establishment.

### POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment during the summer months of American youth, representing all segments of society, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of the natural resources of the United States by the youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

84 STAT. 794

### YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

84 STAT. 795

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age fifteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ during the summer months without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary.

Participants.

Summer employ-  
ment.

(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

Equal opportu-  
nity and employ-  
ment; term.

### SECRETARIAL DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall:

(1) determine the areas under their administrative jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out programs using employees of the Corps;

(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the Corps in their duties. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for at

62 Stat. 982;  
80 Stat. 306.  
28 USC 2671-  
2680.  
80 Stat. 531;  
82 Stat. 98.  
5 USC 8101-8193.

least five years for the operation of any Youth Conservation Corps project. Whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities, including military facilities, shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps where appropriate and with the approval of the Federal agency involved. To minimize transportation costs Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible;

Regulations.

(4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members;

Report to  
President and  
Congress.

(5) prepare a report, indicating the most feasible and efficient method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

83 Stat. 83.  
5 USC 3101  
note.

(b) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support staff.

84 STAT. 795  
84 STAT. 796

#### SECRETARIAL REPORTS

Annual report  
to President  
and Congress.

SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Approved August 13, 1970.

#### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 91-915 accompanying H.R. 15361 (Comm. on Education and Labor) and No. 91-1338 (Comm. of Conference).

SENATE REPORT: No. 91-270 (Comm. on Interior and Insular Affairs).

#### CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Vol. 115 (1969): June 26, considered and passed Senate.

Vol. 116 (1970): June 15, considered and passed House, amended, in lieu of H.R. 15361.

July 30, House agreed to conference report.

Aug. 5, Senate agreed to conference report.